

R. F. Lang, New York, favoring passage of the Weeks bill (H. R. 27567) for a 1-cent letter postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of C. H. Blackall, Boston, Mass., favoring adoption of the Mall site and design as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the New York Fruit Growers' Association, favoring the passage of Senate bill 7208, for making the trans-Atlantic steamships liable for the damages of packages, etc., caused through negligence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of the Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.; C. P. Nelson, Chicago, Ill.; John Burroughs, New York; and Herbert S. Gardner, favoring the passage of the McLean bill granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Long Island Automobile Club, Brooklyn, N. Y., asking that the Lincoln memorial highway bill be in the keeping of the Appropriation Committee instead of the Library Committee; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, Trenton, N. J., protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the control and ownership of national forests to the States wherein they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Legislative Board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring the passage of the Federal workmen's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Conservation Commission, favoring the passage of the Weeks bill making appropriation for the Federal protection of forests from fires; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Fruit Growers' Association, favoring the passage of Senate bill 7208, for making the trans-Atlantic steamships liable for the damages of packages, etc., caused through negligence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., favoring passage of legislation for national ownership and control of all public telephone and telegraph lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Cook County Farmers' Association, protesting against the passage of legislation for the reduction of tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Petition of citizens of Chattanooga, Tenn., protesting against the passage of House bill 5382—the Brantley workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the New York Fruit Growers' Association, favoring the passage of Senate bill 7208, for making the trans-Atlantic steamships liable for the damages of packages, etc., caused through negligence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the control and ownership of the national forests to the States within which they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Conservation Commission, favoring passage of legislation for an increase in the appropriation to aid Federal protection of forests from fire; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, of Eureka, Cal., favoring the passage of Haugen bill, preventing the selling of any colored imitation of butter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of citizens of Lincoln and Flathead, Mont., favoring the passage of legislation preventing any trust, corporation, or individual from obtaining more than 160 acres of land or timber from the Government; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 27545) for the relief of James Diamond for horse lost while hired by the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of the T Square Club, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the adoption of the Mall site and design, as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Bourse, favoring the passage of Senate bill 7503, for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petition of Daniel O'Connell Division, No. 9, Ancient Order of Hibernians, protesting against

having post offices open for delivery of mail on Sunday; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of Hoggison Bros., New York; C. H. Blackall, Boston; the American Group of the Société des Architectes Diplômés par le Gouvernement Français, New York; the Mural Painters, New York; the Architectural League of New York; and the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, New York, favoring the adoption of the Mall site and the design, as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the American Automobile Association, favoring the passage of legislation for the adoption of the national highway from Washington to Gettysburg as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Illinois Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, Chicago, Ill., favoring the adoption of the Mall site, but protesting against the design, as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, for the memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich., favoring the passage of the McLean bill, granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Farmers' National Congress, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3, for Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Federation of Jewish Farmers of America, New York, favoring the passage of legislation for the adoption of a system of farmers' credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the National Association of Railway Commissioners, favoring the passage of Senate bill 6099, for the establishment of a uniform classification of freight in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Duchess Manufacturing Co., Poughkeepsie, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 27567, for a 1-cent letter postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Sol Bloom (Inc.), New York, protesting against the passage of section 2 of the Oldfield patent bill, preventing the fixing of prices by the manufacturers of patent goods; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the United States Live Stock Sanitary Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation to increase the appropriation for the eradication of ticks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Conservation Commission, favoring passage of legislation for an increase in appropriation to aid Federal protection of forests from fire; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Legislative Board, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring the passage of the workmen's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the national forests to the control and ownership of the States within which they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Long Island Auto Club, favoring the keeping of the Lincoln memorial highway bill in the hands of the Appropriations Committee instead of the Library Committee; to the Committee on the Library.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 29, 1913.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. GALLINGER) laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

Florence L. Braun, daughter and sole heir of Thomas J. Lucas, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 1045);

Weltha Post Leggett, widow of Mortimer D. Leggett, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 1044);

Daniel Pelton Duffie, son and sole heir of Alfred N. Duffie, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 1043);

Mary G. Carr, widow of Joseph B. Carr, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 1042);

Morgan K. Barnum, Malvern Hill Barnum, and Reynolds Barnum, children and sole heirs of Henry A. Barnum, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 1041); and

L. A. Williams, administrator of Edward S. Bragg, deceased, v. United States (S. Doc. No. 1040).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 28180) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following bills and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2600. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prevent the exhibition of obscene, lewd, indecent, or vulgar pictures in public places of amusement in the District of Columbia;

S. 6919. An act to amend subchapter 2 of chapter 19 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

S. 7162. An act to amend section 801 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

S. 7508. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to reincorporate and preserve all the corporate franchises and property rights of the de facto corporation known as the German Orphan Asylum Association of the District of Columbia";

S. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution granting to the Fifth Regiment Maryland National Guard the use of the corridors of the courthouse of the District of Columbia upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the marshal of the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect on March 4, 1913, etc.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the Church Federation Council of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ASHURST presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Phoenix, Ariz., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry landowners and homesteaders of Palo Verde Valley, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the Homesteaders Irrigation Co., of Palo Verde Valley, a perpetual right to sufficient water to irrigate that valley, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Claremont, N. H., and a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Amesbury, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of members of the camps of Spanish War Veterans of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and minor children of Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Dogden, N. Dak., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation fixing the requirements governing the receipt, transmission, delivery, and preservation of messages of interstate telegraph and telephone companies, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of the board of directors of the Philadelphia Bourse, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for a reduction of the rate of postage on first-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wilkesburg, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to create

a board of river regulation, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of the congregations of the Seventh-day Adventist Churches of Leslie, Watrousville, Bay City, Spring Arbor, Marine City, Scottville, Otter Lake, and Clifford Lake, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I present a telegram from Charles H. Beckwith, counsel of the Board of Trade of Springfield, Mass., which I ask may be read and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., January 27, 1913.

HON. FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

It is absolutely necessary to obtain adequate navigation on Connecticut River for western Massachusetts that Connecticut River bill be passed without amendment at this session of Congress.

SPRINGFIELD BOARD OF TRADE,  
CHARLES H. BECKWITH, Counsel.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia presented an affidavit in support of the bill (S. 2043) granting a pension to R. L. Miller, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Anacostia Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying that an increase be made in the police force of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

KIOWA AND COMANCHE INDIAN RESERVATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 1046).

Mr. OWEN. I present a memorial from the governor of Oklahoma, relative to certain lands granted to the State of Oklahoma within the Kiowa and Comanche Reservations. I ask that the memorial, with the accompanying illustration, be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE PRESIDENTIAL TERM.

Mr. WORKS. I submit some additional press clippings from the various newspapers in the country bearing upon Senate joint resolution No. 78. I do this because of the claim made on the floor of the Senate that no public interest is being taken in this proposed constitutional amendment. I ask that the clippings may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: Opinions of the press in 1912, compiled by the National Business League of America, preliminary to its nation-wide campaign for a single six-year term for the President of the United States, with ineligibility forever thereafter.

[From the Age, Birmingham, Ala.]

Congressman CLAYTON, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, presents a brief but strong report in support of the proposed constitutional proposition to extend the presidential term to six years and to render a President ineligible to a second term, even though a Vice President succeed to the office and had served but a small fraction of a full term.

Mr. CLAYTON urges the adoption of the proposition because it would lead to higher efficiency in administration, and it would put an end to machine building in the highest office in the gift of the people.

The common sense of the voters will put the proposition into the Constitution if Congress can be induced to submit it. Once ratified it would put an end not only to third-term movements but also to second terms, which are nearly as vicious.

[From the Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala.]

Inasmuch as the proposition of Representative CLAYTON, of Alabama, to make a presidential term six years has been in the minds of the people for some months, and has met with more or less favor, it is entirely probable that six years and not four will be the final choice of the party when the amendment is submitted to the people.

[From the Republican, Phoenix, Ariz.]

The sentiment in favor of a single presidential term is spreading. Senator WORKS has introduced a bill providing for a single term, and the Indiana Republican convention last week adopted a resolution in favor of a single term of six years.

The only objection that might be offered would be that six years might be too long a period; that within that time the people might desire a change of policies. In that respect a four-year term would be better. There is nothing, however, to be said in favor of two terms. If at the end of the President's term the people are satisfied with his policies and the manner of their execution, they may elect another man committed to them.

Under our present system a President, though he might prefer to retire to private life, is practically compelled to seek a renomination and a reelection as an indorsement of his administration.

[From the Herald, Fresno, Cal.]

There is much to be said in favor of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to increase the presidential term



to six years and to make an incumbent forever ineligible for reelection. The longer term would reduce the frequency of elections, lengthen the period between the seasons of business disturbance caused by presidential contests, and give the incumbent all the time necessary to carry out his policies.

[From the Call, San Francisco, Cal.]

General discussion in the press of the country brings out a strong sentiment in favor of the proposition to amend the National Constitution by making the term of President six years and prohibiting reelection. The idea is as old as the Republic. Seven States in the convention of 1787 favored a seven-year term, without right of reelection, and only two States were opposed. Later nine States voted for a six-year term, and only one was opposed. Just why the present plan was finally adopted has never been clearly explained.

The weight of authority favors the change proposed. President Jackson, in 1829, recommended a six-year term without reelection. President Hayes and President Grant followed this example, with this difference, that Grant favored a seven-year term. President Taft has endorsed the proposition, and there is reason to believe that a majority of the present Congress favors it.

[From the Telegram, Bridgeport, Conn.]

With nothing to fear or to hope for at the end of a six-year term, knowing that it would bring with it noneligibility either to a succeeding or a nonconsecutive lease of power, the President would be a disinterested servant of the people for every moment of his service, and those who hold minor offices would cease from troubling. All concerned might be persuaded to remember that they are making history and therefore induced to do their best.

[From the Herald, New Britain, Conn.]

A six-year term would be a distinct advantage to the country, for the reason that it would insure the occupant of the Presidency giving his complete attention to the affairs of state and not to strengthening himself for another term. In other words, he would not play politics. No sooner is a man inaugurated President than he begins to build fences for a second term, and it is a sort of unwritten law that he should be retained in office. This may be desirable with the tenure of office four years, but it would not be desirable if the term was six years. A President would then have an opportunity to work out his governmental policies through three Congresses and in this way would be able to benefit the country more than under the present system. It has been said that if the President was a good man and rendered valuable service, that he should be retained in office, but that argument is neither wise nor logical. To do that would probably mean the establishment of a machine that would soon become corrupt and difficult to remove from power.

[From the Journal-Courier, New Haven, Conn.]

President Taft would limit the presidential office to a single term of six years, and he gives a new reason why he thinks so. He says, "I am a little specific in this matter, because it seems necessary to be, so in order to be understood, I don't care how unambitious or modest a President is, I don't care how determined he is that he himself will not secure his re-nomination (and there are very few indeed who go to that extent), still his subordinates equally interested with him in his reelection will, whenever they have the opportunity, exert their influence and divide their time between the public service and the effort to secure their chief's re-nomination and reelection. It is different to prevent the whole administration from losing a part of its effectiveness for the public good by this diversion to political effort for at least a year of the four of each administration." The single term, then, of six years will achieve two results—it will leave the Chief Executive free to give his best service to the people without temptation of any kind and it will greatly increase the efficiency of the whole administration of government.

[From the Register, New Haven, Conn.]

There are positive arguments for the change. Four years is too short a time for a President to accomplish anything, chiefly because more or less of his time is wasted by the ambition to succeed himself. Increase his term by 50 per cent and relieve him of all worry to the future and you have by at least 100 per cent increased his net effectiveness for the term. Six years is nearly the cycle of man's physical renewal. It is a time in which the able man might accomplish something. Set that as at once his incentive and his limit—his incentive to make his impress on the history of his country then or not at all, his protection as well as his limit—and men worthy to be our Presidents will show a difference in their accomplishments in the office.

[From The Times, Leavenworth, Kans.]

There are many reasons in favor of making this change. Chief of these is, of course, the oft-repeated argument that it would take from the President the motive of ambition to be reelected, and from the beginning of the administration he would be thinking only of giving the country a creditable administration. In such case the politician would have less influence with him and the statesman more. With no second term in which to amend his record a President would use his utmost endeavors to make the best possible record during his one term.

That the proposed amendment would add greatly to the dignity of the office of President can readily be seen. It would make the President more independent, less sensitive to criticism, and after a time less criticized. It would place him where there would be no temptation to take part in unseemly struggles for office, and soon the office of President would come to be looked upon as is that of justice of the Supreme Court—as an office to be filled only by men of high character and learning and men of unquestioned honor and patriotism.

[From the Chicago Journal, Chicago, Ill.]

It is the duty of Congress to pass the single-term, six-year amendment at once. That amendment must provide that no person who has served six years in the White House shall be eligible to election under the new rule. If this amendment is put through Congress without delay the people will have time to ratify it before 1916; and the country will be spared a great deal of trouble and expense.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Chicago, Ill.]

Congress evidently is not willing at this time to consider on its merits the Works resolution for a constitutional amendment providing a single term of six years for each President and Vice President of the United States. In the Senate the other day debate on the resolution was turned into a political dispute as to the relative magnitude of the indiscretions committed by the men now seeking the Presidency. In the House a similar resolution has been shelved until the next session of Congress. Friends of this desirable reform, however, should not permit it to be thrust aside for any great length of time. It must come, and the sooner it comes the better.

So many abuses in government are bred by the second-term frenzy that attacks nearly every President as soon as he sets foot within the White House, that the people of the Nation would gladly lengthen the term of each Executive by two years in exchange for the privilege of making a really good official out of him, through the simple expedient of denying him a reelection.

The contention advanced by supporters of the present system that a President would have no adequate incentive to give good service to the people if the inducement of a second term were not held out to him is insincere. It is perfectly well known that the prospect of a second term is a demoralizing prospect. It unnerves the Executive arm far more frequently than does anything else. Its influence is good in no respect.

In urging Congress to pass the Works resolution its supporters insist that the President of the United States should be freed from the temptation to "play politics." Right, not political expediency, must direct Executive action in the White House.

[From the Record-Herald, Chicago, Ill.]

The proposed amendment to the Constitution restricting the President to one term of six years probably will bring forward few fresh arguments. It is an old question, as old, indeed, as the Government itself, and the wisdom of so restricting the Chief Executive's term has been debated at intervals since the time of Jackson. Yet the later arguments in favor of the reform are strikingly similar to those advanced when the fathers were framing the Government.

The perils of leaving a President free to succeed himself if he can have been considered by students of our form of Government from the first. De Tocqueville considered them, Bryce refers to them, and M. Orogorski, in his Democracy and the Party System in the United States, published in 1910, gives it as his opinion that the reelection of the President must be prohibited. The Russian critic states his case after this fashion:

"The rescue of the Federal service from politics must be completed by submitting it to no influence but that of the Chief Executive and his principal officers throughout the country, and to no end but that of the public weal. Not only from the bosses at Washington must the President be emancipated, but from the party machine altogether. And that can not be achieved so long as the President looks for reelection. The presidential term should be lengthened to seven years and the reelection of the President prohibited."

There, in brief, is the argument of those who have opposed the reelection of the President, though it has been given in much more detail by other writers and speakers. But the gist of the matter is that the President must not be a politician. He must not use the great powers of his office to insure reelection. His appointments must not be made with an eye on the support of State bosses; he must not be tempted to lay aside his convictions and play the demagogue in order to win votes; his dignity must not suffer from a scramble to keep in his seat.

Said Mr. Randolph, speaking in the constitutional convention, "If he (the President) ought to be independent, he should not be left under a temptation to court a reappointment."

This thought seemed to have pursued the members of the convention from the very moment they began to consider the powers which were to be vested in the Chief Executive. On August 6 the committee of detail, to whom had been referred the various proposals, reported in favor of electing a President for a seven-year term and making him ineligible for a second term. This proposal in different forms was considered again and again.

There were some present who felt that a Chief Executive's dignity must suffer through being forced to join the mass again as a common citizen. To these spoke "Dr." Franklin, with his dry humor:

"In free governments the rulers are the servants and the people their superiors and sovereigns. For the former, therefore, to return among the latter was not to degrade but to promote them. And it would be imposing an unreasonable burden on them to keep them always in a state of servitude and not allow them to become again one of the masters."

In the end the convention took no action restricting the President's eligibility for reelection. It was not till the time of Jackson that the question again became a real issue. Jackson's friends said during the campaign that he would not consent to run a second time, and this declaration is thought to have added to the popularity of the candidate. He was a staunch supporter of the principle of one term when he took over the office of President. In his first message to Congress, in December, 1829, he suggested the wisdom of restricting the President to one term. In his annual message of the following year he said:

"In order, particularly, that this appointee may be placed beyond the reach of any improper influence, in order that he may approach the solemn responsibilities of the highest office in the gift of a free people, uncommitted to any other course than the strict line of constitutional duty, and that the securities for this independence may be rendered as strong as the nature of power and the weakness of its possessor will admit, I can not too earnestly invite your attention to the propriety of promoting such amendment of the Constitution as will render him ineligible after one term of service."

There can be little doubt that Jackson was sincere in his efforts to have the President's term restricted, notwithstanding the fact that he stood for reelection himself. It is pretty generally admitted that up to the time of his death he continued to believe what he had charged in his first campaign, that there was a cabal to continue President Adams in office, and that he had performed an important public service in defeating its plans.

Certain it is that from the time of Jackson down to Lincoln a clearly defined popular prejudice existed against the idea of a second term for the Chief Magistrate. This prejudice was overcome in the case of Lincoln by the demands of an extraordinary situation.

Later on the question of restricting the Executive's term was brought before the public when President Grant showed a desire for a third term. But even when he became the candidate of his party for a

second term there were those who objected strenuously. Chief of these was Horace Greeley, who, having alienated a considerable portion of his own party, became the candidate of the Democratic and Liberal Republican Parties against Grant. During the campaign which ensued the issue of the second term was raised, and Mr. Greeley opposed it with all the eloquence and force for which he was noted.

In an article contributed to a now defunct periodical called the *Galaxy*, in 1872, Mr. Greeley said:

"All that is needed is an intelligent, earnest, widespread conviction that the practice of reelecting a Chief Magistrate while in office is fraught with evil and peril; that it distracts his attention from the proper cares and duties of his station and impels him to consider not who are the fittest and most worthy to fill the offices in his gift, but what choice will be most likely to improve his chances of re-election."

"Here is the right man for the Supreme Court, who has no influential clique at his back; here is a rival who is neither so capable nor so worthy, but whose friends control the party machine in a populous State and can send delegates to the approaching national convention either for or against the incumbent of the White House; who that knows human nature can doubt that the less fit aspirant has the better prospect of obtaining that judgeship? And this instance may stand for a thousand."

Speakers and writers of that day who joined in the discussion were accustomed to point to at least one excellence in the constitution of the Confederate States so recently overthrown. That constitution, they said, reflected at least one bit of experience which the Federal Government had had and had failed to benefit by. It made the President ineligible to succeed himself.

[From the *Mall*, Moline, Ill.]

Every argument for a one-term limitation is sound. Not one argument so far advanced against it bears dissection. By making the term of the President six years and barring him from again seeking the office, he will be left to work solely for the good of the country from the first day.

[From the *Chronicle*, Marion, Ind.]

There is soundness and wisdom in Mr. Taft's suggestion of a single term of six years for our Presidents. The gain to the people would be obvious and very great. In many ways a presidential campaign is a public nuisance. The minds of the people are distracted, business, whether foolishly or not, has acquired the habit of coming to a halt, as though some great calamity impended—probably Mr. Taft will recall, not without a reminiscent smile, that during the late campaign something was said about the closing of factory doors in case the voting went wrong—and men, women, too, are drenched with a flood of utterance and wearied with passionate mouthings. It is unnecessary; it is stupid. If we should reduce the frequency of the national upheaval from three times in 12 years to twice in 12 years the gain would be immense. There would be the added and important advantage of shielding the incumbent of the office from the temptation to use power and patronage in the effort to secure a second term.

[From the *Gazette*, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.]

A six-year term would make the country more democratic. It would prevent the building up of political machines whose main purpose is to perpetuate some man or set of men in office.

The six-year term would give a President a better opportunity to make good. It would be unproductive of harm, because the Nation always elects a fairly representative man to the Chief Magistracy.

A six-year term would lessen the political turmoil, and that alone would be worth a great deal more than "the price of admission."

By all means let us have the single six-year term.

[From the *Times-Democrat*, New Orleans, La.]

More than one presidential record has been marred by this seeking after a second term. During two years out of the four the desire for re-election influences, to a greater or less extent, the average Executive's official acts and colors his view of pending issues and questions. There is no reason to believe that we can, under the present system, get entirely away from that practice and custom. But by rigid limitation of the President's term of service, definitely fixed by the law of the land, we can relieve the Executive of the temptation now placed in his way. Measurably we can insure that he will serve the Nation during his full term of office instead of using his office for a part of the term to serve his own ambitions and candidacy for re-election. An aggressive campaign for the adoption of the one-term plan ought to be organized, we think, at once, while its wisdom and necessity are so widely admitted by the voters.

[From the *Times*, Cumberland, Md.]

Some unconscious humorist assures the *Chicago Record-Herald* that "there is no public sentiment" in favor of the single six-year presidential term proposed.

We are bound to admit that we have heard no riotous demonstrations by advocates of such an amendment to the Constitution. But the majority of the Members of Congress favor it; the respective Judiciary Committees of the two Houses have indorsed it; progressive and independent newspapers are urging it; and men of light and leading in every part of the country are "coming out" for it. The National Business League of America is working for it.

In the Senate two insurgents, CUMMINS and WORKS, are fathering the amendment, and some of its opponents are threatening a filibuster to prevent action on the resolution submitting it. They know that it will pass if it reaches a vote.

The unconscious humorist or noise-loving editors who fail to discover public sentiment for the amendment should try to understand that public sentiment is not always expressed by stormy mass meetings addressed by excited orators.

[From the *Gazette*, Haverhill, Mass.]

There is nothing in the Constitution as it now is to prevent a life tenure of the presidential office. When the Constitution was created no one had any reason to suppose that the Executive department would become so powerful as it has become. Nothing has stood in the way of long-continued tenure of the presidential office but wholesome public sentiment and the antithird-term tradition, which arose from Wash-

ington's refusal of a third election. If that tradition is once violated and the barriers against a third term are broken down, they may be down for a long time.

A President in office who is a candidate for reelection has an undue advantage over other candidates in his own party for the nomination, and an undue advantage over his opponent of the other party in the election.

We are coming to the one-term Presidency as rapidly as the circumstances will permit. The present campaign has made sentiment in that direction, and the Clayton resolution may be the means of achieving the result earlier than expected.

[From the *Evening Union*, Springfield, Mass.]

Six years has been suggested as a reasonable limit, and there are many pronounced advocates of the six-year single-term idea, but there are some that favor a single four-year term and others that believe in making it eight years. The arguments in favor of one are as good as those in support of another, except, perhaps, that the four-year term may be a little too short to enable a President to carry out the policies and pledges to which he and his party are committed. But the main idea, the single-term limit, has everything to commend it.

[From the *Call*, Paterson, N. J.]

Many influential men of New York, when asked to comment on the question of a constitutional amendment limiting the President to a single six-year term, expressed themselves favorably to the change. Some thought it would make for greater stability in the business of the country, but it was generally believed by both Republicans and Democrats that the most important effect would be that on the conduct of the incumbent of the office himself. Most of them agreed that under the present four-year term, with eligibility for reelection, the President, no matter how well intentioned he may be, is unavoidably drawn into a certain amount of political intriguing that inevitably interferes with the discharge of his duties in a broad and statesmanlike manner.

[From the *Chautauquan*, Chautauqua, N. Y.]

Andrew Jackson thought that a single term without reelection for a President under any circumstances would add another safeguard to our liberties. Second terms are not now feared as threats to our liberties; whether third or fourth terms are a menace and danger is a matter upon which opinion differs. But what is undeniable and clear is that second and third terms are incompatible with efficient and single-minded public service. The best of men can not be exposed to constant temptation. The temptation of incumbents to use patronage, to build or strengthen machines, to "mend fences," to make sure of delegates, to control conventions, is too strong to be resisted in most cases.

Nor is this all. Men in office who are candidates for second or third terms may, and generally do, consider bills and policies from the political or personal point of view. Some do it unconsciously, but all do it more or less. The incumbent who is not and can not be a candidate again for the same office is free to deal with public matters on their merits, to use his independent and sincere judgment, to make the public good his sole test or concern. This would be an enormous gain to good government and to "the rule of the people."

The more the question is studied the more vital and progressive the single-term idea is seen to be. There is not the least danger that the supply of presidential "timber" will ever be so restricted that second or third terms will be necessary. No man or set of men is really indispensable to an age or generation or nation. Any vigorous, sound body politic contains many men and women who are fit to do the work of the day. To dip into the great mass of citizens and select administrators and servants with an eye to results, without overestimating any individual or underestimating the virtue and intelligence of his equals, is not always an easy task. But stable and prosperous democracies must endeavor to do this very thing. The single six-year presidential term idea is consonant with the warnings of history and with common sense.

[From the *Leader-Republican*, Gloversville, N. Y.]

Much, indeed, might be advanced in favor of the single six-year term as Chief Executive of the Nation, and in the opinion of the *Leader-Republican* a long step in the right direction will have been taken when discussion of the change proposed shall have been crystallized into favorable action. As yet the proposal is a comparatively new one, but it is one which from its practical nature seems destined to grow and expand in favor with the people.

[From the *Financial World*, New York City.]

All classes, even the chronic office-holding politicians, whatever may be their party affiliations or opinions, will hail with satisfaction the preliminary efforts now being made in Congress to submit to the several States an amendment to the National Constitution, so as to extend the presidential term to six years and make the incumbent ineligible to succeed himself.

It would prove a most excellent move if this same rule of nonsuccession were carried further to include every elective office. Politicians are more or less selfish in the consideration of the general welfare, although statesmen in office affect to believe that the interests they have in public affairs—national, State, and local—are above all personal consideration. However, if that interest is not personally touching the pocketbook of officeholders, it is at least fed on the ambition to hold on as long as possible to the honors heaped upon them by their fellowmen. Man would not be man without ambitions.

But limit the Presidency and other elective offices to one term and the probabilities are that the men so honored will apply to their stewardship the very best ability, sincerity, and honesty that is in them. They will realize that there is no further reward to seek when their term of office ends.

The little Republic of Switzerland has demonstrated conclusively the great advantages that lie in limiting offices of state to only one term. One term is enough.

[From the *Eagle*, Brooklyn, N. Y.]

We have confidence that the people and the States will soon set a prohibition of more than a single term in the Constitution itself, incidentally lengthening the one term from four to six years, with no reelection, as could wisely have been done at the start. The term could well be lengthened to reduce strain on a term of the present duration.



It could well be made incapable of repetition, to remove from any President the temptation to pervert his service and patronage to the continuance of himself in place and to stir in each party the growth of statesmen fit to make into Presidents.

[From the Financial World, New York City.]

This much-to-be-desired reform can only be satisfactorily brought about by limiting the Presidency to one term and making that term half as long again as the present four-year tenure. Six years seems generally agreed upon as long enough to allow a new Executive to put through such political measures to which he is committed and on which he has made his campaign for the high office.

It is undeniably true that business halts more or less during a national campaign, if for no other reason than is to be found in the natural hesitating against going ahead when there is the possibility of a change of administration and with it a flood of new laws to which business will have to adjust itself. Six years, therefore, would give to business a period of rest from radical adjustments longer than is possible under our four-year system.

But the greatest handicap the country suffers under our present scheme of electing our Chief Executive is to be found in the right of succession, on which at present there is no limitation. Not a single bar is up to prevent a President succeeding himself as often as he may be able to prevail upon the electors to keep him in office. Only custom is in the way. This was set by George Washington in refusing a third nomination, contending that by serving twice as President he had done his duty toward his country and the people.

The one and the greatest advantage in the one-term movement for President, and which offsets any of the minor defects that may be cited, is that it would effectively do away with the political maneuvering now indulged in by a President in his natural ambition to become his own successor. With one term only possible to him, every President would give the country the best administration within his ability irrespective of political considerations, and more than that could not be expected. Naturally, he would desire that his administration should pass into history as one reflecting fame upon him, and he would act accordingly.

The one-term plan would forever blast the political ambitions which every President now keeps in mind to maintain himself in office through two terms at least, and which so often proves an obstacle to an impartial administration.

[From the Herald, New York City.]

President Taft's plea for one term of six years for the President of the United States will undoubtedly give new impetus to this measure now before Congress.

The reform must come in the shape of a constitutional amendment, and after the bill has passed both Houses and become a law the amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the States. But cumbersome as the process of amending the Constitution is, this great reform may be much nearer than persons generally suppose.

There has long been a very strong feeling in this country that two terms of four years each are enough for a President. Many persons believe that to limit the only term to six years is too short a period and would extend it to eight years.

With this view the Herald heartily agrees. The term should be eight years instead of six, and then there should be a proviso against any man ever seeking the Presidency again. Indeed, it might be wise to make some financial provisions for retiring Presidents.

But eight years are not too much. Washington served almost eight years; Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and Grant served eight years; Lincoln and McKinley were reelected, but were assassinated before the end of their second terms; Cleveland was elected to a second term after a four years' interim, and Roosevelt was elected to a second term, having filled the uncompleted term of McKinley as his first term.

But to have a President elected for an eight-year term would free the country from much strife, and to provide that there should be but one term would be bound to work for national security.

[From the Evening Journal, New York City.]

Mrs. George J. Gould said to-day that she was an advocate of extending the term of the President of the United States to six years. She thinks that the longer period would give an opportunity for working out presidential reforms, and that a President who could not get a renomination would be less apt to play into the hands of the politicians. She would limit the six-year President to a single term.

"The Presidency of the United States has become the most powerful in the world," she said at her home, No. 657 Fifth Avenue. "So much responsibility and work devolve upon the incumbent of that high office that I sometimes marvel at the ability with which Presidents meet the obligations that are imposed upon them."

"The presidential term should be extended to six years and Presidents should be ineligible for reelection. The results, I am confident, would be a higher standard of public service and a greater devotion to the interests of the people."

"The experience of France, which makes the presidential term seven years, has, in the main, proved highly successful."

[From Leslie's Weekly, New York City.]

The actual advantages of a single six-year presidential term overshadow the possible dangers of the change. The suggestion is made that if the electors made a colossal blunder in their choice the country might have a despot saddled upon it for six long years, whereas at present the most unsatisfactory President would not have to be endured longer than four years. If so disposed, a President might inflict incalculable damage upon the country; yet upon the Chief Executive, as upon every other official or department of the Government, there are certain constitutional checks, and as a last recourse a President, for good and sufficient cause, may at any time be impeached during his term of office, whether it be long or short.

In favor of a single long term, without possibility of renomination or reelection, there are decided advantages. Six years is long enough for a President to map out and to carry to successful completion a constructive national policy. Again, the periods of upheaval and unsettling so disastrous to the business interests of the country as a whole will be put two years further apart. Presidential year is always an "off" year. These "off" years should be separated as far as practicable.

Perhaps the greatest advantage of all is that a single term would insure a more fearless and disinterested service from the occupant of the presidential chair. Every President desires a reelection as a mark of approval of his administration, and hardly is he inducted into office before he begins to lay plans to secure another nomination. Though

every move he makes may be perfectly honorable, his usefulness to the country as a whole is, in a measure, lessened by this desire for another term. Just as we always expect better results from a President's second term than from his first, so we would expect the best of which he was capable in a single long term.

[From The Tribune, New York City.]

The wide approval given to the suggestion of a single presidential term is gratifying to The Tribune, which is earnestly desirous of seeing an end put to the embarrassments of a situation compelling a President to consider a renomination at the hands of his party as an indispensable endorsement of the merit of his first administration. Many men of prominence in this community have given their support to the single-term movement on the ground that its success would relieve the President of an unenviable obligation to court the favor of politicians in control of the party machinery and leave him free, if the term were extended to six years, to develop his policies with less distracting interference from them and the officeholders and office seekers whom they principally represent.

If a President only served a single term and was ineligible for reelection, it would be much easier to carry through such an admirable plan as that of Mr. Taft for the extension of the classified service so as to cover all postmasters, collectors, registers, surveyors, and other higher grade employees whose offices are now considered legitimate party patronage. A President would have no inducement to select Federal officers with a view of getting their assistance in a campaign for renomination, could choose them for merit only, and insist that they keep out of partisan politics.

The responsibilities of the President have multiplied so rapidly in recent years and the labor thrust upon him is now so enormous that he ought to be allowed to give all his time and energy to the public business, with no thought for the thousand details of the process of paving the way for his own renomination and reelection. Mr. Taft, who has been noted for his neglect to take advantage of political opportunities, has properly complained of the useless strain put upon the President by forcing him to appoint and reappoint thousands of officers who should be selected by the competitive method and put under the protection of the classified service. When the second-term tradition is got rid of the President will be able to devote himself completely to his official duties and become more than ever a constructive force in administration and legislation and the leader not only of his own party but of the voters, without regard to party. Freed from the shackles of partisanship, he can become the President of all parties and all sections, as the framers of the Constitution wisely intended him to be.

Opposition to a single term is nowhere active and aggressive, and the adoption of a one-term amendment can be delayed only by lack of initiative and the too-prevalent disposition to think that the Constitution can be and should be amended only in times of stress and disturbances. It can be changed just as easily in an era of tranquillity, and all that is necessary to get the reform under way is to force action in Congress on a resolution which has already been reported favorably in each House.

Prominent men who have expressed opinions favoring a six-year term, with ineligibility for reelection, as advocated by the Tribune, are: Silas W. Burt, president of the Civil Service Reform Association; Frederick W. Whitledge, receiver of the Third Avenue Railway; Frederick R. Coudert, the lawyer; George M. Miller, president of St. Luke's Hospital; William Nelson Cromwell, the lawyer; Otto Bannard, the banker; Paul M. Warburg, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; William R. Wilcox, chairman of the Public Service Commission; Samuel H. Ordway, president of the Civil Service Reform League; William Jay Schieffelin, president of the Citizens' Union; Benjamin F. Tracy, of the Manhattan Life Insurance Co.; J. Hampden Dougherty, the lawyer; Charles H. Strong, president of the City Club; Adolph Lewisohn, president of the General Development Co.; Eugene A. Philbin, formerly district attorney of New York County; Hugh Hastings, former State historian; Charles J. Peabody, of Brooklyn; Welding Ring, former president of the Produce Exchange; Edward Lauterbach, former member of the board of regents; and Henry R. Towne, president of the Merchants' Association.

[From the Sun, New York City.]

The joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a single term of six years for President, which is to come before the House of Representatives and the United States Senate on the reassembling of those bodies, is known as the Clayton resolution, being named after Representative HENRY D. CLAYTON, of Alabama, and reads:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of six years; and no person who has held the office by election, or who has acted as President under the Constitution or any law made in pursuance thereof, shall ever again be eligible to hold said office."

The resolution includes the Vice President.

[From the Press, Utica, N. Y.]

Naturally enough there is a renewal of the discussion of the six-year one-term proposition. Now, as always before, there has seemed to be more arguments for than against it. Until human nature can be very materially changed, that seems to be the best possible solution of what is otherwise bound to be a perplexing problem. It is not at all liable that any man would be elected President of the United States who was unworthy or unable satisfactorily to complete a six-year term. In fact, the last four would probably be better than the first two years, for experience is worth a great deal, especially in an office of this kind, and that is one of the arguments advanced in favor of a second term. Under the present system the man who fails to be renominated is looked upon as having been discarded by his party, and the man who, being renominated, fails of reelection is looked upon as having been discarded by the whole people. Accordingly renomination and reelection are considered essential to a satisfactory reputation and standing in history.

In order to get the renomination there is an irresistible temptation to do certain things and leave certain things undone for the express purpose of getting votes or to acquire personal popularity. There is only one standard by which a President ought to judge every question which comes before him, and that is as to whether it is right and best for the general welfare. If he considers his own or his party's interest in that connection he is doing the people an injustice. Many a man has had a good appointment under a President for no other reason than that it would strengthen the Executive in this or that State.



The public service has been the loser by that operation. When a man knows that he will not be eligible for renomination he will endeavor to make the best possible record for himself, and indeed will be determined to do it. Knowing that doing right will not lose him a delegate he will have no temptation to do anything else. His chief end, aim, and ambition will be to make an honorable record, which will deserve and have an honorable place for all time in American history. That is as it ought to be and of itself constitutes a reason.

[From the Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio.]

A resolution providing for a constitutional amendment to change the presidential term from four to six years and to make the President ineligible for reelection will soon come up for action in the Senate.

Only one argument approaching validity has been urged against the amendment. This is that the spread of popular-preference presidential primaries throughout the Union will largely do away with the evils incident to a presidential campaign for renomination and reelection.

To some extent this contention is correct. The shameless use of patronage which has been customary will be of no avail in future pre-convention campaign if the popular primary plan is generally adopted. The steam roller can roll conventions flat, but it can not crush the expression of popular sentiment. If popular preference is to become the accepted plan of presidential nomination a large part of the evil of the campaign for a second term will be eliminated.

Enough will remain, however, to make desirable the enactment of the single-term amendment. Even though a President is not busily engaged in oiling the patronage steam roller he will have his eyes constantly fixed on the second-term goal. He will be tempted to shape his policies to catch the popular fancy, regardless of his own convictions. He can not forget the popular primary any more than he can the balloting in November. He will be working first for popularity within his party and afterwards for popularity in the Nation.

A President who spends much effort to gain popular adulation is not likely to be the most useful executive. A President who assumes office with a six-year term ahead of him and with no possibility of reelection may proceed to give the Nation the best there is in him without fear and without favor.

Popular-preference primaries will go far toward nullifying the utility of the patronage steam roller. The single-term amendment will remove the President from the temptation of playing partisan politics. Both are desirable. Neither should be put aside because the other seems likely of enforcement.

[From the Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio.]

The single-term idea is not directed against any man or party. There is nothing "political" in it in the ordinary and superficial sense of the word. It is inspired by the higher and purer conceptions of government and service.

Those who favor a single term of proper length—six or perhaps even eight years—do so because they wish to insure single-minded devotion to good government at all times in the White House, because they wish to remove temptation and pressure, to enable the President to deal with measures, issues, and men strictly on their merits.

Properly presented and explained the advanced single-term idea can not fail to commend itself to progressive and sober-minded citizens.

[From The Journal, Columbus, Ohio.]

In both Houses of Congress the resolution to amend the Constitution by making the presidential term six years and no more has been indorsed by both Judiciary Committees. Now, the matter ought to be pushed to a vote and settled. There is no doubt the people favor the one-term idea. It is hardly a proposition to be argued.

Glorious for the Nation would it be if a President should be elected only every six years. And great would the presidency be if it did not have to think of a reelection.

[From The Journal, Hamilton, Ohio.]

That single term of six years for President has great possibilities. Therefore it is going to win by constitutional amendment.

[From The Sun, Springfield, Ohio.]

President Taft embraced a popular cause when he declared for a six-year term for the President of the United States and a legal bar to reelection. This will do away with much of the uncertainty in national affairs just previous to the national conventions, and will undoubtedly make for better results in the Executive office.

Under the present system the last year of every presidential term where the President is a candidate for the renomination and reelection is given over to political activities rather than to the duties of the office. The President's mind is taken up with schemes to further his own political ambitions. His subordinates dependent upon their chief retaining his place to hold their positions also give of their time to building up party fences. The holders of the many appointive places in the Federal service also are on the alert to serve the prevailing party and are unable to give the proper attention to their routine work.

The official business of the Nation is neglected for a period of almost a year preceding every national election. Following the election comes a period of readjustment, especially if the rival party has prevailed and new incumbents are appointed to the places.

In the days just preceding the election it is impossible to secure beneficial legislation. Everything is tainted with politics. The party in power refuses to pass any measure which is not available for campaign purposes, and the opposition steadfastly opposes any good measure for fear that it may be used in support of the plans of the rival party.

This condition is unsatisfactory. It seems that the people are entitled to have faithful impartial service from the men they have elevated to office and for whose salaries a good percentage of the taxes is required. Yet, from the very nature of the present system, it is impossible to receive but a minor part of the efforts of the first termers during the pre-election year.

In his speech Saturday night, President Taft has pointed one way of ending the present conditions. A six-year term, without possibility of reelection, would give the administration five years to work after the first year of readjustment. It would be possible for the President and his subordinates to expend their energy in making a record for efficiency rather than for expert political moves. With the heads of the departments demanding efficiency rather than political service the work of the men holding subordinate places would be correspondingly improved. The natural tendency of the inferiors would be to hold onto their places

through good work rather than hazard their positions in the hope of securing a better under the next administration.

Four years is too short a time for the great national policies to be worked out. The work would be scarcely under way before another administration would begin; but under the six-year term it would be possible to carry out a consistent policy to a successful termination. Many bits of good legislation have been prevented because the term of the legislators ended before they had reached a vote, and a new party, with new policies, effectually prevented any attempt to pass it.

The new system is gaining in favor with all parties. Various public men have from time to time advocated the establishment of a six-year term for Presidents, and it would not be surprising if some action was taken to lengthen the term of the President following Wilson.

[From the Courier, Zanesville, Ohio.]

If the Constitution is amended to limit the tenure of the presidential chair to one term of six years, the office will be placed where it ought to be—above the plane of politics—and its incumbent will be free to act without personal fear of the political consequences. President Taft favors the idea and President Elect Wilson has so expressed himself in the past. The people, we believe, would indorse the proposition if given the opportunity.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg.]

To forbid reelection of a President implies no distrust of the people beyond that which the people have of themselves. The whole Constitution is a body of limitations, placed by the people themselves on the exercise of their undisputed power. This would be but an added limitation adopted by the people of their own free will.

The danger to the national interests through a change of Presidents in a time of crisis such as existed during the Civil War is too remote to be a serious factor. The people can be relied upon to elect a new President who will carry on those policies of a retiring President which they approve.

The people need fewer elections and their public servants need to be freed from the disturbing influence of frequent campaigns. With a six-year term and with ineligibility we should have longer periods of calm, better service, more continuity of policy, and wider interest in elections when they do come.

[From the Gazette, Altoona, Pa.]

The single six-year term would emancipate the President and increase his power and prestige. He would and could sign or veto bills without thinking of "votes," and the pressure of spoilsmen and practical politicians would be largely removed; self-respect, firmness, dignity, conscientious devotion to duty would be immensely strengthened and exalted by the change.

[From the American, Mahanoy City, Pa.]

President Taft was not the first citizen to advocate the amendment of the Federal Constitution so as to extend the presidential term from four to six years, making the occupant of the office ineligible for reelection. Others have spoken in favor of such a change, and a good many thoughtful citizens favor it.

They are opposed to the quadrennial agitation of the country hitherto inevitable to a national campaign. They think it injures business and gives Americans a bad reputation among their cousins on the other side of the seas. And then it is generally believed that freedom from ambition to succeed himself would enable a President to serve his country better than would be the case if he were moved by a desire to be his own successor.

The ordinary public officer who is eligible to succeed himself is likely to keep an eye on his chances and to move with a caution born of ambition. We suspect a one-term President generally would be more efficient than one who spent much time scheming to succeed himself.

[From the Press, Philadelphia, Pa.]

Whatever else the Congress in its expiring session shall do or leave undone, the resolution pending in the Senate looking to the adoption of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, providing for the extension of the presidential term to six years and making the incumbent ineligible for reelection ought to be favorably acted upon. There is no question such an amendment would be adopted by every State in the Union. It would greatly add to the efficiency and independence of the President if his conduct in office were unbiased by any consideration other than the advancement of the public interest. It would end at once and for good both second and third term demagoguery, with the implied drift toward one-man power and an abandonment of representative government. The danger of prolonging the incumbency of an unfit or dangerous man, who should be chosen to the Presidency through extension of the term of office, is sufficiently guarded against by the reservation of the power of impeachment in case of need.

[From the Evening Telegraph, Philadelphia, Pa.]

To lengthen the presidential term to six years and limit it to a single period meets with our hearty approval. The question should no longer be left to the flexible interpretation of mere unwritten precedents, but a definite settlement of it should be incorporated in the Constitution in the form of a necessary and legal amendment. The lengthening and limiting of the term would give any ambitious President a long enough time to shape his policies and test them by experience, and would remove the temptation from such to ask for a second term on a specious plea and secure it by a questionable use of Executive patronage.

[From the Dispatch, York, Pa.]

Contrary to a very general impression, the proposal to limit the presidential tenure to a single term is not new. At the very beginning of the Republic, when the great statesmen of that period were struggling with the mighty problems before them, the matter of the presidential term was a much-discussed and vexing theme. All sorts of suggestions were offered, ranging from life tenure to a single term of four years. When it was finally decided to make the presidential term four years, with eligibility for reelection, a single vote in the convention was the determining factor.

The great advantage to the country in limiting the presidential tenure to a single term of six years would be the enabling of the President to devote all his time to his official duties. Every President would know that he had but one term in which to perfect his policies and



carry them out, and he would not be distracted from his purpose by the necessity of laying plans for reelection almost from the day of his inauguration. Each President would have the courage to do what he believed was right, unembarrassed by the threats of his enemies that they would "beat him for reelection." A President would be in large measure exempt from the attacks of his enemies within the party, and at the expiration of his term he would retire to private life with indifference as to whether or not he had played the political game to the satisfaction of the politicians.

[From the Gazette, York, Pa.]

The question of a single term for President of the United States is certain to be discussed exhaustively, if not exhaustively, in the next few years. By its platform the Democratic Party is bound to take action in that direction, and in doing so it will be indorsed by a majority of the citizens of all parties. The phase of this question about which there is going to be the most debate is what the length of the term should be. There have been some who argued that it should be eight years. Now, however, it is generally conceded that this would be too long. Six years or four years seem to be the popular limits.

Those who argue in favor of the shorter term say that four years are plenty long enough for a good man and that six years would be altogether too long for a poor man to occupy the presidential chair. All of this latter part of the contention may be granted. But would not even two years be too long for an unfit President? It was the original intention of the founders of the Government to have short terms. Jefferson in a letter quotes that maxim of that day as being "Where annual election ends, tyranny begins." That, of course, would be a practical application of genuine democracy, the theory of government not necessarily the policy of the Democratic Party, but it will be granted by all that our country is too large for it to work out successfully. Massachusetts elects State officers annually, and even in that small State the frequency of the important elections is becoming burdensome.

So that it is plain we must look for some other way out of the difficulty. It is clear that the annual election of President is out of the question, and the eight-year term would be too long. It is true that six years would be too long for an unfit President, and so would four years. It seems, then, that the best way to settle the matter is to make sure of the right man and the right platform, and then give him time enough to thoroughly try out the policies for which he stands. If this is done, there can be little valid objection to a six-year term, and there can be little question that this is none too long to work out important policies.

Another thing should be borne in mind—the people are beginning to weary of the frequent and strenuous campaigns. There is danger that this may result in such an increasing indifference that it will be easier than it now is for incompetent and even dangerous men to be "put over" by scheming interests who look upon "practical" politics as a part of their business game. This must be reckoned with. Less frequent elections and a more thorough stirring up of interest in the campaigns seems the best solution.

Furthermore, it would be a great gain if this could be so arranged that the State elections could be held during those years when there were no national elections. Suppose, for example, that our Presidents were elected every six years and the Members of the Lower House of Congress every three years, so that a congressional election would come in the middle of the presidential term, as now. That would give all the States ample opportunity to arrange their elections at times when there would be no complications with national problems. Would not this result in better government all around? We believe it would.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn.]

There is a growing inclination on the part of the public toward the six-year term. There are sensible reasons why such a term should be established instead of the brief four years now allotted to the President.

Everyone will admit that nothing so disturbs the commercial welfare of the country as an election. From ocean to ocean the States have been disturbed for the past two months, and will be until November.

A political campaign, even over a local issue, disturbs business. Brothers turn against brothers, fathers against their sons, over politics. The real truth is that we have too much of this sort of thing, and if it is not a presidential campaign it is another, with its turmoil and excitement.

Each President elected has entered office with the determination to do the best he could for the country. We have had no bad men in office. Our Presidents, irrespective of party, have been men of class. They have lived up to the platforms upon which they were elected as far as possible. No President has ever been associated with any graft scheme, and all have been practically free from the taint of scandal. It stands to reason that only men of the highest character present themselves for such an exalted office. Men of the highest character are elected, and the country has prospered under every President we have had since the days of George Washington.

It is safe to trust anyone who can secure the indorsement of the people, and if he is elected for six or eight years instead of four, so much the better. As it is, scarcely does a President get comfortably seated in office than it is necessary to run again. This keeps the country upset. No one can rest easily during a campaign. It is more uncertain in some States than in others. There is always an element of uncertainty in a campaign. No one can say what the outcome will be or what the effect on the country will be. Wall Street holds the balance of power. It can create a panic or quell one. Wall Street is always uneasy during a campaign, and while the street is uneasy so is the country.

With fewer elections the country would be better off, and with a longer presidential term there would be a smaller opportunity for strife and unsettled business conditions.

[From the News, Wheeling, W. Va.]

From all indications an attempt will be made at the next session of Congress to change the tenure of office for the President of the United States from a term of four years to a single term of six years.

The change will necessitate an amendment to the Constitution, and will entail no little inconvenience. However, it seems to be a good idea.

At present the length of a presidential term is four years. A man may succeed himself as many times as he is able to secure the nomination and election, although custom makes it bad form to ask for another after one has served two terms.

A man is elected for a term of four years. During this time all of his actions are usually directed so that he will be able to secure a second nomination and election. His actions are "a play to the galleries," as it were. During his first term his time is so taken up by this "gallery play" that he is likely to neglect many of his duties

and act contrary to the way he would act if his tenure were restricted to a single term.

During this term the members of the Cabinet, who owe their office to appointment from the Executive, play politics along with their chief. At the end of the first four years there is a possibility of defeat for the candidate for reelection.

If the tenure of office were made a single term of six years, the administration would undoubtedly be made more efficient. The time would be long enough to give a good Executive an opportunity to put into effect his policies and not long enough to permit an incapable Executive to harm the country.

The change is a good one. Think it over.

[From the Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va.]

Presidential elections come too often, and Presidents too frequently play politics. A four-year term hardly enables a President to institute and carry through an established line of policy, and eligibility for reelection tempts him to try to secure reelection. As a rule, the first two years of a President's administration are given up to getting acquainted with his job, and the second two years are filled with efforts to secure another term. Lengthening the President's term and forbidding reelection would place the office of the Presidency on a higher plane and insure a higher grade of public service.

[From the Chicago Evening Post, Tuesday, Oct. 25, 1904.]

REVELL FOR SIX YEARS—CHICAGO MAN URGES THAT THE TERM OF PRESIDENT SHOULD BE LIMITED—TELLING POINTS ARE MADE—SPEECH GIVEN AT OPENING OF COMMERCIAL CONGRESS AT ST. LOUIS.

ST. LOUIS, October 25.

The opening session of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress was held here to-day in Convention Hall at the World's Fair. The congress will continue the remainder of the week.

Alexander H. Revell, of Chicago, vice president of the National Business League, delivered an address on the question of a single six-year term for President of the United States.

The feature of the opening session was the large attendance of visitors, showing the general interest in the proceedings. During the sessions of the congress, which will continue through Saturday, matters of importance to residents of the trans-Mississippi region will be discussed, such as irrigation, good roads, river navigation, and interstate-commerce laws.

Following the invocation by Rev. Michael Burnham, of St. Louis, the meeting was called to order by the chairman of the executive committee, Thomas Richardson, of Portland, Oreg. In a short introductory address, Mr. Richardson presented the president of the congress, R. C. Kerens, of St. Louis.

ADDRESS OF MR. REVELL.

Mr. Revell spoke as follows:

"The National Business League has started a movement to secure an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will fix the term of office of the President at six years instead of four years. At the same time, and by the same amendment, it is proposed to make the President ineligible to reelection.

"I am not aware that anyone questions the expediency of the proposed change. Indeed, so far as I can learn, all admit that the changes proposed would be sound public policy. It is perhaps true that those who are engaged in politics for diversion or for profit may be lukewarm in the effort to prolong the period between elections. But it is not likely that the politician—the man who is trying to be politic and responsive to public demands—will interpose to prevent an admittedly needed and popular amendment.

"All things considered it may be accepted that the sentiment of the country is such that the amendment may be secured upon the presentation of the proper arguments to the electors and those who as officials may be instrumentalities in bringing it about. The labor that is before us consists in pulling together and putting in order the half-formulated latent sentiment in regard to the proposed amendment. It is this labor which the National Business League has undertaken to perform. It is to this endeavor that all right-minded electors are expected to extend courageous and industrious assistance.

"No reasonable objection can be raised against the lengthening of the President's term of office.

"As things now are there is, in fact, only about three years of settled conditions, and many would acknowledge only two years. The fourth year is given up to the campaign. In fact, it is only during the first two years of the presidential term that business, and that word does not mean the great capitalists only, can feel that conditions are settled. Along toward the end of the term the policy which the President has pursued is used by the opposition on which to unite in order to create an 'issue' for the oncoming campaign. The effect of all this is that business becomes more or less gambling against the chances of the presidential succession.

"LOOK TO THE GOVERNMENT.

"There is a growing tendency in this, and indeed in all countries, to look upon the government or the administration as the cause of the prosperity or adversity of the people. This tendency disposes the people to look more and more to the government as the author of their conditions. Demagogues, selfishly and ignorantly finding this tendency to exist, endeavor from time to time to arouse the voter into active hostility against the administration. He endeavors to convince his too easily persuaded auditors that a change of administration policy, especially in relation to the currency or the tariff, we will say, will change their fortunes from bad to good.

"The effect of this is that during any presidential term and under any policy which may be put into practice there are those who are disposed to find fault with it and to create an impression that exactly the opposite policy would be more in the interest of the general public. At times this sort of criticism results in the formation of parties predicated on propositions to squarely reverse the policy which is being put into practice by the sitting President and to put into operation an entirely opposite policy.

"The effect of this condition of things is to present to the business man a situation in which two distinctly opposite policies are proposed. He can make no calculations for the future, and he must hold in abeyance many of his enterprises and curtail his business until he finds out what is going to be done—what the result of the election will be.

"This condition of suspense operates to depress business and intensify adverse conditions, or at least to modify the benefits of the administrative policy which may be in practice at the time. The element of unwarranted doubt operates to bring about changes of policies

and Presidents, changes that are in themselves unwarranted and possibly harmful.

"NOT FAIR TO JUDGE BY.

"This presidential year is hardly a fair one to judge by. It is the most prosperous presidential year in 44 years, and perhaps for a longer period. This would hardly be the time or place, and it is not essential that we discuss all the reasons for this. While the year has been phenomenal as an election year, and with the splendid agricultural and financial situation, still there has been a pronounced flimidity among business men in regard to inaugurating new business enterprises.

"Also there has been and is very general complaint, especially in manufacturing industries. Hence, the question naturally arises, Would not the year 1904 have been a record-breaking year had there been no presidential election?

"A longer term for the President would not only create a longer period of business security, but it would give ample time for a President to formulate and carry out his policies. Very often presidential administrative plans can not be put into operation and the benefits of them realized by the general public before the time for another campaign approaches. In other words, the presidential term of four years is too brief for a President to inaugurate and carry out a policy. A six-year term would give ample time.

"Another thing, the election of a President for six years would have a tendency to silence those agitators who preach discontent and advise the people to look forward to the next presidential election as the time when they could make a change which would repair their grievances. Six years would be too long to look ahead. With a six-year term the country would settle down to calmness and steadiness in business, which is unknown under the present four-year term.

"By making the President ineligible to succeed himself he would be enabled to leave politics behind when he took the oath of office. He could direct his efforts to being a good President. The record of a President would then merit careful comparison.

"By gradual growth it has come to be an unwritten law that a President is expected to succeed himself. It is expected that his second election will be a 'vindication' of his first term of office. There is no question about this fact. For a President to decline to be a candidate for reelection after having served a four-year term would be taken to mean that he believed that he could not be reelected.

"In other words, a failure to demand renomination would be accepted as a confession of the failure of him and his party to properly administer the Government.

"Thus it is incumbent on a President at the end of his term to again become a candidate for reelection even if he does not want to, and, in a measure, his party must renominate him even if he did not want renomination. As a matter of fact, this condition of things has practically established that the presidential service of a man is eight years.

"MUST KEEP IN FAVOR.

"This fact that the President must secure renomination and reelection compels him so to conduct and warp his administrative policies that he will remain in favor with the politicians who are to renominate him and also to cater to the more transient popular sentiment. No President since Washington that we know of has ever acted differently. No man, as mankind goes, can be expected to be at his best under such condition of things. He may fairly be expected to be at his worst. Poor human nature is not such that Presidents may be expected to crucify themselves for the unappreciated welfare of their supporters.

"Representative Gaines, of Tennessee, has been making a historical study of the question of one term for Presidents, and points out that it was a live question with the convention that framed the Constitution and has been under discussion a good part of the time since.

"One of the greatest curses of American politics is the spoils system. By means of their appointive power, from President down to coroner, with a few exceptions, public officials aspire to succeed themselves, and as soon as they are elected utilize the patronage of office in order to pay for favors rendered in the past and expected to be obtained in the future. A President who was not by custom expected to secure a 'vindication' by reelection would not be under compulsion to use his appointive power in order to make himself secure against the next nomination and election. In short, the one-term principle would tend, as nothing else would tend, to eradicate the spoils system.

"Now, then, what is to be done? The Constitution of the United States says concerning the term of the President: 'He shall hold his office during the term of four years.' In relation to the matter of amendments the Constitution says:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution; or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures, three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

"TO APPEAL TO CONGRESS.

"From this it will be seen that either the State legislatures or Congress may initiate the proposition to amend the Constitution. The practice generally has been for Congress to propose and submit amendments to the several State legislatures. The same course will be pursued in this case, and Congress will be asked to propose an amendment making the presidential term to be six years and the President ineligible to reelection.

"The endeavor of the National Business League will be to make it apparent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress that the people actually desire that the proposed amendment be submitted to the legislatures. If this fact can be demonstrated, there is no doubt that Congress will hasten to comply with the demands of the public. Ratification in the State legislatures will be brought about by the same means. The responsiveness of our legislative bodies to the demands of business interests are always prompt and satisfactory.

"More and more the welfare of all the people is becoming and is understood to be wrapped up in and dependent upon business prosperity. To make it manifest, therefore, that the business men of the country believe and demand a presidential term of six years and no renomination of Presidents will be to assure the adoption of the amendment. The arousal of the business interests of the country, it will be seen, is the real, actual labor that is before the business league. Those who have undertaken to propagate the amendment proposition should see to it that those under them, those connected with them in business, their club fellows, their friends and customers, are fully advised of the amendment and its expected good results."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 8188) to amend section 113 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911, reported it without amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 27475) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1164) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, submitted a report (No. 1168), accompanied by a bill (S. 8314) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

- S. 602. Kate Brown.
- S. 630. James R. Haldeman.
- S. 910. Mary Francis.
- S. 923. Jane De Graw.
- S. 1012. Carrie Engberg.
- S. 1572. Sarah E. McCann.
- S. 1843. Susan M. Sumner.
- S. 1991. Mary J. Anderson.
- S. 3079. John W. Anderson.
- S. 3546. John S. Rodgers.
- S. 3550. John G. Myers.
- S. 3555. Andrew J. Furry.
- S. 3895. Charles F. Cooken.
- S. 3980. William Robertson.
- S. 3998. George W. Leslie.
- S. 4012. William H. Weber.
- S. 4014. George Ketzler.
- S. 4020. August Schurman.
- S. 4021. Samuel J. Riley.
- S. 4080. William E. Huestis.
- S. 4593. Orlina M. Cadwell.
- S. 4602. George Warnick.
- S. 5013. Louis M. Lea.
- S. 5374. Thomas F. Stevens.
- S. 5444. Darwin Zeek.
- S. 5737. David F. Stewart.
- S. 5779. Nathan Vanaman.
- S. 5941. Joseph Johnson.
- S. 5994. John N. Postlethwait.
- S. 6212. John Miller.
- S. 6261. John O. Branson.
- S. 6375. Adam P. S. Poisal.
- S. 6388. Francis M. Hanes.
- S. 6475. John L. Skinner, jr.
- S. 6639. John P. Glenn.
- S. 6642. William A. Stewart.
- S. 6643. William Turnbeaugh.
- S. 6785. Julia A. Snedeker.
- S. 6872. Martha R. Brown.
- S. 7058. Elias Redmon.
- S. 7085. George Moffatt.
- S. 7090. Kate F. Sage.
- S. 7213. Myra Van Winkle.
- S. 7236. Charles G. Glidden.
- S. 7280. Clara V. King.
- S. 7342. James Griffey.
- S. 7344. Sarah F. Boynton.
- S. 7357. Emiles Pomeroy.
- S. 7346. Fannie M. Page.
- S. 7398. Thomas Gannon.
- S. 7429. Orlan A. Hibbs.
- S. 7450. William H. Hall.
- S. 7451. William T. Francis.
- S. 7462. Marshall D. House.
- S. 7465. Henry McClure.
- S. 7471. Mary J. Wood.
- S. 7496. Ephraim Benedict Murphy, alias Ephraim Benedict.
- S. 7497. Jay Doty.
- S. 7553. Lorenzo F. Nolan.
- S. 7613. Erastus G. Cummings.
- S. 7786. Victoria L. McHone.
- S. 7902. Margaret L. Thompson.
- S. 8071. Daniel Hand.
- S. 8098. Horace C. Webber.
- S. 8131. Stanley H. Husted.
- S. 8145. Joseph Cassidy.
- S. 8144. William L. Sheaff.
- S. 8157. Louis C. Emmett.



S. 8158. Christian Bowman.  
 S. 8159. Stephen Collier.  
 S. 8160. Baxter Johnson.  
 S. 8163. Mary E. Allen.  
 S. 8173. Georgiana Packard.  
 S. 8187. Josephine E. Miller.  
 S. 8201. Delia H. Austin.  
 S. 8203. Wendell P. Hood.  
 S. 8206. Lucy Gamble.  
 S. 8208. Elizabeth Croft.  
 S. 8213. Stephen B. Johnson.  
 S. 8237. Ferdinand O. Tension.  
 S. 8239. Thomas Moody.  
 S. 8240. Charles Belknap.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4241) to encourage rifle practice and promote a patriotic spirit among the citizens and youth of the United States, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1165) thereon.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 110) to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in Todd and Bennett Counties, in the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1166) thereon.

#### YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. WORKS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 8279) to amend an act approved October 1, 1890, entitled "An act to set apart certain tracts of land in the State of California as forest reservations," and I submit a report (No. 1163) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SOLDIERS' HOME AT SANTA MONICA, CAL.

Mr. JONES. Under Senate resolution 160 the Committee on Military Affairs or a subcommittee thereof was directed to make an investigation of the management of the Branch National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and Sailors at Santa Monica, Cal. A subcommittee was appointed in pursuance of the resolution and made the investigation and submitted its findings and recommendations.

By direction of the full committee I submit the report of the subcommittee (Rept. No. 1167), together with a bill to transfer the Pacific Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the War Department, recommended by it. In doing so, I will state that the bill is reported with the recommendation of the subcommittee for such action and consideration as the Senate may desire to take upon it, and it is not to be understood as being recommended by the full Committee on Military Affairs. I ask that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 8297) to transfer the Pacific Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the War Department was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will take the liberty of inquiring of the Senator from Washington whether the bill should not be referred to the committee.

Mr. JONES. The resolution directed the committee or a subcommittee to report the facts and their findings to the Senate. Under the peculiar language of the resolution, I think the bill should go to the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SANDERS:

A bill (S. 8298) to provide for the enlargement of the Federal building at Chattanooga, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 8299) to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," approved March 1, 1911.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To what committee does the Senator from Tennessee desire to have the bill referred?

Mr. SANDERS. The Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is disposed to refer it to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources.

Mr. SANDERS. It is really a water-power bill. I think it should go to the Committee on Commerce, but I am not sure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 8300) to provide for the admission in evidence of certificates of the heads of executive departments and independent executive establishments to show the nonemployment of persons brought to trial under section 32 of the act of March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 8301) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Nichols (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 8302) to provide for the erection of a public building at Naugatuck, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 8303) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Bentley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 8304) for the relief of Rodger Caplette; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON:

A bill (S. 8305) to promote and encourage the building of modern public highways by granting aid thereto under certain conditions; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 8306) to amend an act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 19, 1906, as amended by the act approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 8307) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Strayer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 8308) granting a pension to Joseph H. Mayo (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 8309) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 8310) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River opposite the town of Newport, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 8311) providing for a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the country at the time of the American Revolution (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 8312) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at the city of Union Springs, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 8313) to provide for the erection of a public building at Williamson, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. McLEAN submitted an amendment providing for a survey to secure the increased depth of the harbor at Stamford, Conn., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States \$10,000 on deposit to the credit of the Creek Indians and pay it to the trustees of the Henry Kendall College, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make a per capita payment of \$200 from the tribal trust funds of the Seminole Indians to each individual officially enrolled as a member of that tribe, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which

was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for improving the Willamette River, Oreg., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment providing for the purchase of subsistence supplies for all vessels in harbor-boat service not otherwise provided for, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$20,000 for the erection and completion of a hospital building and equipment at Pima Agency, Ariz., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$60,000 for the purchase of not less than 600 acres of land convenient to the city of Washington, D. C., to be used for target-practice purposes, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON submitted an amendment providing for a survey of the Leipsic River, Del., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

#### CONNECTICUT RIVER DAM.

Mr. JONES. I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 8033) to authorize the Connecticut River Co. to relocate and construct a dam across the Connecticut River, and so forth. I ask that it be read and lie on the table.

The proposed amendment was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JONES to the bill (S. 8033) to authorize the Connecticut River Co. to relocate and construct a dam across the Connecticut River above the village of Windsor Locks, in the State of Connecticut, viz: Strike out all of section 1 after the words "And provided further," in line 19, page 2, and insert the following:

"The assent of Congress herein given shall not be complete and operative until there shall be filed with the Secretary of War an agreement signed by the said Connecticut River Co. and the proper authorities of the State of Connecticut in which is recognized and acknowledged the full authority of the State of Connecticut to supervise, regulate, and control the rates to be charged by said company, its successors and assigns, for the energy developed; and the right of said State from time to time to readjust such rates; and the right of said State to supervise, regulate, and control said corporation, its successors or assigns, its management, stocks, bonds, or evidences of indebtedness in such manner as may be provided from time to time by the laws of said State; and the right of said State to exact from said corporation, its successors or assigns, such annual charges as may be just and reasonable, taking into account the amount spent and required to be spent by said corporation in improving the navigation of said river and the right of said corporation to a reasonable return on the fair value of such dam and appurtenances, works and property, allowing for the cost of construction, maintenance, and renewal.

#### PUNISHMENT OF MURDER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JONES submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the President be requested to return the bill (S. 7162) to amend section 801 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

#### HARBOR REGULATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1072) to amend section 895 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, which were, on page 2, line 10, to strike out "ice, snow," and insert "or," and on page 2, line 10, to strike out "or trash."

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 23939. An act to legalize titles in the District of Columbia to certain citizens was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 28180. An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR DAVIS.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent to dispose of a merely formal matter, Senate resolution 425, au-

thorizing the Secretary of the Senate to pay the actual expenses incurred by the committee attending the funeral of the late Senator JEFF DAVIS. It will take only the time to read it.

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President of the Senate pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of the late Senator JEFF DAVIS, from the State of Arkansas, vouchers for the same to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS FOR CAMPAIGN PURPOSES.

Mr. JONES. I ask the Senate to consider Senate resolution 418, amending Senate resolution 79, in regard to the investigation of campaign contributions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution named by him.

The resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That Senate resolution 79, agreed to August 26, 1912, be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting, on line 2, page 2, of said resolution, after the word "eight," the words "November 5, 1912."

#### PROPOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. As a substitute for that motion, I move that the Senate proceed with the consideration of House bill 22871, to establish extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That motion is not in order under the rule. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas and Mr. SMITH of Georgia called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when Mr. BACON's name was called). I desire to state that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] is detained at home by sickness in his family.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MASSEY]. I desire this announcement to stand on each vote for the day. I vote "yea."

Mr. THORNTON (when Mr. FOSTER's name was called). I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. FOSTER] on account of illness in his family, and ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GARDNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. I desire to transfer that pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PAYNTER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM]. He seems not to have voted. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. RICHARDSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and vote. I vote "yea." I make this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably absent from the city. I desire this statement to stand for the day.

Mr. KERN (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness.

While I am on my feet I desire to transfer my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], instead of to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], as previously announced.



Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. SANDERS. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA].

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], with whom I am paired, has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Then I will withdraw my vote, having a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE], who is absent from the Chamber. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CULBERSON (after having voted in the negative). I desire to inquire if the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that that Senator has not voted.

Mr. CULBERSON. As I have a general pair with him, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (after having voted in the negative). I voted upon entering the Chamber just now, but I am informed that a pair had previously been transferred to me. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a moment ago I announced my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and transferred it to the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], who was not then present. I wish now to withdraw the transfer, so as to give the Senator from Maine an opportunity to vote, and also to withdraw my vote, and to stand paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Under that statement I vote "nay."

Mr. STEPHENSON entered the Chamber, and voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], to whom I transferred my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], having voted, I withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will ask that the vote be again recapitulated, there having been several changes.

The Secretary recapitulated the vote.

Mr. CULBERSON. I desire to inquire if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is paired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no information on the subject.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Chair could probably secure it from the Secretary.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is paired with me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon, it has just been stated, is paired.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, a Senator sitting by me suggests that the name of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] was called on the roll call. Is that a fact?

Mr. OLIVER. My name was called on the roll call, but I transferred my pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and voted.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER].

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 31, as follows:

## YEAS—31.

Brandegee	Cummins	McCumber	Sanders
Brown	Gallinger	McLean	Smoot
Burnham	Gamble	Nelson	Stephenson
Burton	Gronna	Oliver	Sutherland
Catron	Jackson	Page	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Perkins	Wetmore
Crawford	Kenyon	Richardson	Works
Cullom	Lodge	Root	

## NAYS—31.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Myers	Shively
Bristow	Johnson Me.	O'Gorman	Simmons
Bryan	Johnston, Ala.	Overman	Smith, Ariz.
Chilton	Johnston, Tex.	Owen	Smith, Ga.
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Percy	Swanson
Fletcher	La Follette	Perky	Thomas
Gardner	Martin, Va.	Poindexter	Thornton
Helskell	Martine, N. J.	Pomerene	

## NOT VOTING—33.

Bacon	Culberson	Lea	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Curtis	Lippitt	Stone
Borah	Dillingham	Massey	Tillman
Bourne	Dixon	Newlands	Warren
Bradley	du Pont	Paynter	Watson
Briggs	Fall	Penrose	Williams
Chamberlain	Foster	Reed	
Clapp	Gore	Smith, Md.	
Crane	Guggenheim	Smith, Mich.	

So the Senate refused to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

## AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 22871, known as the agricultural extension departments bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 22871) to establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the Senate that it is exceedingly important to act to-day upon this bill, together with the amendments thereto. Tomorrow we take up the constitutional amendment under unanimous consent, and following that the bill of the Senator from Vermont (S. 3) would come up as an original proposition. The friends of that measure well understand that if it should be passed independently of the House measure it would go to the House, would be referred to a committee, and there would be practically no chance to pass any part of it at this session of Congress. On the other hand, if we add to the House bill such portions of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont as we have perfected, the amendments would go at once to the House with the House bill, and necessarily would receive consideration. The House might decline to accept them immediately, and then a conference might be necessary. But before the conference committee we would have an opportunity of considering the amendments presented by the Senator from Vermont and adopted by the Senate, and out of this conference we could hope for legislation.

It is therefore exceedingly important to act on this measure to-day, while the House bill is before the Senate, and before Senate bill No. 3—the original bill of the Senator from Vermont—is reached. It will be reached immediately following the consideration of the constitutional amendment by unanimous consent.

I want to suggest to the friends of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont a few modifications of it. I wish very much that the Senator from Vermont were in his place, in order that we might have his consideration of these suggestions.

Mr. PAGE entered the Chamber.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will take the liberty of repeating, since the return of the Senator from Vermont, what I have just said: It is extremely important, if we are to pass any of the provisions contained in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, that we should have action to-day, as to-morrow we take up the constitutional amendment under unanimous consent, and immediately following that the original bill of the Senator from Vermont will come up. If we should act upon that original bill, there would be no chance for legislation at this session.

I think it unwise to send to the House, as an amendment to the House bill, all of the provisions presented by the Senator from Vermont. They involve an appropriation of \$13,000,000. They involve so much new matter that we could hardly hope to obtain for them thoughtful consideration. Yet if we should take about three of them, instead of all six, and send them to the House, there would not be such a volume of them as to almost deter the mind from undertaking to consider them. If we would take his section 11, making the appropriation to secondary schools that have established distinct industrial or trades departments, and pass it, omitting section 10; if we would take, then, his appropriation to agricultural high schools, and pass it; if we would take his appropriation to normal

schools, and pass it, those three simple and distinct propositions sent to the House could be readily brought to the attention of Members of the House, and I think there would be much more hope of accomplishing something.

I have been continuously working upon this matter whenever I have had an opportunity; and I think we could make a few amendments, by eliminating a part of the measure for the present, and pass it. With those eliminations, I am ready to vote for it, and I am ready to help try to pass it through the House.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. PAGE. I shall be very glad, indeed, to have the valuable assistance of the Senator from Georgia in perfecting my bill in any way that seems to be right and best. But, as I look at the matter now, it seems to me that the provisions had better go through substantially as they appear in the original Page bill, so called, and then, out of conference, we may be able to get some results, such as have been suggested by the Senator from Georgia.

I am informed that there will be a little further discussion upon the bill this morning. Meanwhile I will give the matter consideration, and I will see the Senator from Georgia promptly about it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to give to the Senate again, very briefly, my criticisms upon the appropriation contained in section 10.

It is not limited to schools that have industrial departments. It would apply to over 13,000 schools. It would give only about \$600 to each school. It undertakes to give instruction in agriculture, in the industries, in the trades, and in household economics. I do not think anyone who has had experience with the effort to introduce industrial and trades training in a high school has failed to find that good work can not be accomplished except where there is a distinct department devoted to the work, with equipment and with appropriation sufficient really to do something.

In the case of the work in the trades and the industries, you require equipment with tools; you require separate rooms for the instruction; you require a man especially trained, who is skilled with his hands, and who also has sufficient mental equipment to give the instruction. You can not put that kind of work into a high school with one or two thousand dollars; and if you tried it, your money would simply be wasted.

The Senator's second provision, No. 11, recognizes the distinction between undertaking to introduce industrial and trades work generally in high schools and undertaking to introduce it only in those which are equipped for it, and it limits the appropriation to schools with a distinct department, where the amount of expenditure will be sufficient to amount to something.

I speak so positively upon this subject because I have seen the experiment tried. For nearly 20 years I was actively connected with the public schools of my own city. We tried the experiment of expending a small sum in each school to try to introduce industrial and trades work. At the end of a couple of years we were compelled to abandon it and to establish a distinct department of industrial and trades work, with a distinct building and with a much larger appropriation. So far as I have been able to learn, practically all educators who have been enlisted in behalf of trades and industrial work give the same report—that the money is wasted when you undertake to add it to a high school without reference to the preparedness of the high school for the work. Not only is it wasted, but it interferes with the regular work of the high school, damaging that which has been already done without introducing any new, substantial work of real value.

Mr. President, I move to strike from the amendment of the Senator from Vermont section 10.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia proposes an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out section 10.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia has forgotten that section 10 has been already stricken out.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A substitute for section 10 has been placed in the amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. What was formerly section 3 has been substituted for the original section 10.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; that is now section 10.

Mr. CUMMINS. While I am on my feet, I desire to say that there is a great deal of force in what the Senator from Georgia has said. I prefer the old section 3 to section 10, as proposed

by the Senator from Vermont, but I would not anticipate great results from either section. While I intend to follow the Senator from Vermont in this matter, frankness compels me to say that I think the value of his bill lies in other provisions in it rather than in section 3.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to say to the Senator that I have made up my mind to support section 11. I am going to support it and vote for it.

Mr. CUMMINS. But of course section 10 has been already stricken out of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am referring to the substituted section, which is the original section 3. I am seeking to direct the bill to the high school that has an industrial department, as contained in section 11, instead of undertaking to make an appropriation to a high school which has no industrial department. If we could get it, I would put the whole \$6,000,000 into section 11 rather than to have three millions of it in section 3 and three millions of it in section 11, because from section 11 we will really get results.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have some objections, however, to the present form of section 11. I agree, however, that little can be done, under the provisions of this bill, in the general high schools of the country. But I do not think the provision should be so severe with regard to those high schools that have a department for instruction in the trades and industries and home economics. But I will refer to that later on.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the situation, the provision which the Senator from Georgia seeks to have placed in the bill is the same section that was stricken out on the motion of the Senator from Iowa. The Senate having passed upon that matter affirmatively, I hardly feel as though I could properly consent to a change now, and to a reversal of the action of the Senate, under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understood the effect of the action of the Senate to be to substitute original section 3 for section 10 as the Senator from Vermont brought it in. I did not understand the action of the Senate to be a final determination that it would even retain section 3 as section 10. It was to the consideration of the advisability of concentrating our efforts on section 11, and giving what we give for industrial and trades work to schools where they have a distinct department for such work, that I was addressing myself before the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I inquire what is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion of the Senator from Georgia is to strike out section 10 from the amendment of the Senator from Vermont as amended.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I had not intended to make any observations upon this particular section of the bill. If, however, we are to take for granted everything that has been said here in regard to this particular section, then farming is indeed a limited industry.

I am somewhat surprised to hear Senators say that they are opposed to the provision for vocational education and instruction in the trades and industries and home economics because it would not better the conditions on the farm. Does any Senator mean to say that the farmer has not as much use for a vocational education or special training in the trades and home economics as those engaged in any other industry? The farmer has as much use for the trade of blacksmith or carpenter or harness maker as any of the persons engaged in those trades in the cities.

I should like to have some of these "farmers" who come from the large cities tell me what work is to be done on a farm. I have not opposed the passage of the so-called House bill. I am not saying now that I intend to oppose the passage of the House bill. But it seems to me that the farmer in the large city is more interested in the passage of this measure than are the real farmers who live on their farms.

Are we expending these millions of dollars merely for the benefit of the farmer? Have we a right to take the money, from the Treasury of the United States for the sole purpose of helping the farmer? Is it the belief of any Senator that the provisions of this bill will accomplish that very purpose?

Mr. President, you can not name a single trade embodied in this measure offered by the Senator from Vermont but what the farmer has as much use for it and it is of as much benefit to the farmer as it is for him to take hold of the plow handle and plow the ground.

Farming has indeed become very limited in its scope if nothing more is required of those engaged in it than the mere knowledge of knowing how to handle the shovel and the plow. You tell me that farming is the greatest industry in the world. I say yes; perhaps I ought not to say it, because I am a prac-



tical farmer, but I wish to say to you, sir, that the business of farming does not consist of such a limited scope as some would have us to believe. In my judgment the provisions in the bill now offered by the Senator from Vermont would ultimately be of great benefit and a great blessing not only to those engaged in the vocations and trades, but to farmers and to mankind.

Are we to make an appropriation for the farmer to teach him how to hold the plow or how to swing the ax? Do you suppose that that is the only thing to be done on a farm?

Mr. President, I am perhaps as much interested in this measure as any man can be, but I confess I am less enthusiastic over it than are some of the farmers in the big cities. It is not as important to teach the farmer how to produce crops as it is to find him a market for his products or to reduce the cost of production so that his industry will yield him a profit. The State which I have the honor, in part, to represent produced more than 150,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1912. That, sir, is an indication, so far as production is concerned, that the farmer in my State needs no special teaching in that line. I am not objecting, however, to any measure that will aid people in other sections of the country where they have not learned to farm as we have learned it in North Dakota.

Mr. President, to show to the Senate that the statement I have just made should receive some consideration, I wish to quote from the agricultural expert who has just made his first report of what is known as the Better Farming Association of North Dakota. Mr. Thomas P. Cooper, who, I understand, has been employed by the Federal Government, has this to say on that particular point:

The problems of the agricultural sections of the State are to a great extent economic and social rather than the immediate question of production. Under the systems of farming which have been developed the North Dakota farmer has become expert in the production of the small grains cheaply. Farmers generally are well acquainted with the methods of agriculture which will enable them to produce crops. They are not familiar, however, with the methods of farm management required under other systems of farming or where new crops and live stock are to be used. Much additional knowledge is necessary.

The fundamental problem, then, consists in arousing action among farmers and the public to such an extent that new systems of farming, new crops, and live stock will be generally adopted. This necessitates the creation of a new sentiment toward our farm lands and toward the farm as a permanent source of wealth and of income. Briefly, the basic agricultural problems confronting the work of this association may be classified as, first, the maintenance of the fertility of the soil, involving new cropping systems and the use of live stock; second, the introduction and general use of new economic crops, such as clovers, alfalfa, winter grains, and cord; third—

And, Mr. President, I think this should have been first—

Third, the business reorganization of the farm for greater profits.

If you want to help the farmer in his condition, make it possible for him to receive a greater remuneration from what he produces. Will any Senator tell me that if farming were as profitable as other industries we would experience any difficulty in getting more people on the farms? In that respect farming has not been a profitable business.

I wish to quote briefly from a special message of Theodore Roosevelt, sent to the Senate February 9, 1909, upon this subject:

Yet farming does not yield either the profit or the satisfaction that it ought to yield and may be made to yield.

The special commission appointed to make a report on the condition of country life has this to say:

(A) STATEMENT OF THE GENERAL FARM PROBLEM.

The farm labor problem, however, is complicated by several special conditions, such as the fact that the need for labor is not continuous, the lack of conveniences of living for the laborer, long hours, the want of companionship, and in some places the apparently low wages. Because of these conditions the necessary drift of workmen is from the open country to the town. On the part of the employer the problem is complicated by the difficulty of securing labor, even at the relatively high prices now prevailing, that is competent to handle modern farm machinery and to care for live stock and to handle the special work of the improved dairy. It is further complicated in all parts of the country by the competition of railroads, mines, and factories, which, by reason of shorter hours, apparently higher pay, and the opportunities for social diversion and often of dissipation, attract the native farm hand to the towns and cities.

The difficulty of securing good labor is so great in many parts of the country that farmers are driven to dispose of their farms, leaving their land to be worked on shares by more or less irresponsible tenants, or selling them outright, often to foreigners. All absentee and proxy farming (which seems to be increasing) creates serious social problems in the regions thus affected. There is not sufficient good labor available in the country to enable us to farm our lands under present systems of agriculture and to develop our institutions effectively. Our native labor supply could be much increased by such hygienic measures as would lessen the unnecessary death rate among country children and insure better health to workmen.

So long as the labor supply is not equal to the demand the country can not compete with the town in securing labor. The country must meet the essential conditions offered by the town or change the kind of farming.

The most marked reaction to the labor difficulty is the change in modes of farm management, whereby farming is slowly adapting itself to the situation. In some cases this change is in the nature of more intensive and businesslike methods whereby the farmer becomes able

to secure a better class of labor and to employ it more continuously. More frequently, however, the change is in the nature of a simplification of the business and a less full and active farm life. In the sod regions of the Northeast the tendency is toward a simple or even a primitive nature farming, with the maximum of grazing and meadow and the minimum of hand labor. In many States the more difficult lands are being given up and machinery farming is extending. This results in an unequal development of the country as a whole, with a marked shift in the social equilibrium. The only real solution of the present labor problem must lie in improved methods of farming. These improvements will be forced by the inevitable depletion of soil fertility under any and all one-crop systems in every part of the country, and realized by the adoption on the part of intelligent, progressive farmers of a rotation of crops and a system of husbandry that will enable them to employ their labor by the year and thereby secure a higher type of workman by providing him a home with all its appurtenances. The development of local industries will also contribute to the solution of the problem.

The excessive hours of labor on farms must be shortened.

Anyone who has had experience in farming will know that farming has not been a profitable business.

But you tell me, sir, that we are going to help the farmer now and show him how he can increase production. Of course, we all welcome the assistance to an education which will help us to grow two blades where one grew before. We are all in favor of teaching the farmer to be able to produce more on the same number of acres than he has produced before. But I want to say that with the intensified farming greater production means an increased cost in farming. It is not because the farmer does not know how to produce larger crops and increase the yield on the farm, but it is because the profit he receives from his farm does not enable him to employ the labor that is necessary to produce that larger yield. It is for that reason and for that reason alone that we are unable to produce as much per acre in the United States as they are producing in foreign countries. We pay higher prices for labor than they do in Europe. We are confronted with the same conditions in the business of farming that other industries of this country have to experience, in that of paying higher wages. During the busy season of the year we have paid for the commonest kind of labor \$3.50 to \$4 per day.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. GRONNA. With pleasure.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am very much interested in the Senator's suggestion that the farmer is confronted with the same wage problem that the industries are in the industrial centers. Does not the Senator think that it is a much greater problem for the farmer? Does he not have to pay much higher wages in proportion than are paid in the industries, because of the inclination of European immigrants to go to cities and not to go to the country?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I think that is true, although I do not want anyone to take my judgment on that. I only know what we have to pay on the farm. I do not know what has to be paid by other industries.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask a question of the Senator?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GRONNA. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. ROOT. I do not know whether it is a fact in the Senator's part of the country, but it is in mine, that the one trouble about the wage question with the farmer is that there is a very short period during the year, under our method of conducting a farm, during which a large amount of help is needed. It is very difficult to get help where you can employ a man only a couple of months; it is only the chance, floating fellow that you can pick up. Where you can give a man but two months' employment or three months' employment during the year, and nothing for nine months, of course you have a much smaller supply and poorer material, and you have to pay higher wages.

It has seemed to me in studying the farm problems in central and northern New York, under conditions which prevail over a considerable part of the country certainly, that one very important thing is that there shall be suggested and taught to farmers, particularly to the small farmers, a method of utilizing their farms so that the need for employment will come along at one time after another and run during the greater part of the year. It certainly is under some conditions possible to bring about an equalization of requirement for labor instead of having a very high requirement at one time during the year and not during the remainder. Does not the Senator think something useful might be done in that direction?

Mr. GRONNA. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from New York for making the observation. It is absolutely true, as he has stated, and the condition in my State is exactly as he has stated. But, Mr. President, the provision of this bill is that 75 per cent of the money which we are now appropriat-



ing shall be used absolutely for field tests. If the provisions of the Lever bill were such that we could use this appropriation in educating the farmers to change the present methods of farming and thereby change present conditions, to give instructions how to grow new crops, how to change the farm from a grain farm to a dairy farm, then, Mr. President, I should have nothing to say in opposition to taking 75 per cent of this entire appropriation for that work.

We grow certain crops and have become, so to speak, specialists in producing them. We want to get away from that idea of growing but one kind of a crop, and the bill proposed by the Senator from Vermont will in a large measure help the agricultural interests in that way. We want more prosperity and fewer hobos. We are sick and tired of feeding and employing the large population of hobos that come from the cities that we necessarily have been employing during the summer months. They are not fit to perform the labor that is to be performed on the farm; they know no more about the business of farming than the farmer as a class knows about the profession of the law; they are incapable of performing their work in a satisfactory manner to the farmer or to those who employ them. But, sir, teach them vocations and trades and then let them come to our part of the country, and although we may have to pay them just as high wages as we are paying them now, they will be able to perform their work in a better way. You will have increased the efficiency of those men, for they have been taught how to perform labor.

The condition in the country in the rural districts is such that it is absolutely impossible to get competent labor on the farm. Why, sir, it is necessary for those who own their farms to work from 12 to 18 hours per day; and the necessary labor can not be had. It goes to show two things—first, that the business of farming is not profitable, and, secondly, that labor can not be had. You tell me the farmer has been very successful. Yes; he has been successful, because his land has increased in value. But take the farmer as a class, take his business as a producer, allow him reasonable wages for his work, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that within the last two decades farming has not been a profitable business.

I believe, sir, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont should have serious consideration. It may be that certain changes should be made in the measure, but I do not want to see it voted down simply on sentiment.

Neither do I want to let the so-called House bill pass without calling attention to the fact. I want the RECORD to show, if you please, that this legislation is not asked for by the farmer. I am not here to oppose it because the farmer does not ask for it. I am not here simply for the purpose of representing the farmer. I am here to help to the best of my ability each and every industry of the United States, but I do not want it to be understood that in the appropriation of this large amount of money you are simply appropriating it for the farmer, because you are not, and you know that you are not. I do not want the name of the farmer conjured with right here to help along other industries. I am willing to help other industries, as I have said, but let us do it upon their merits, or let us oppose them upon their demerits.

Mr. President, I have received a newspaper printed in my State, and I found in that paper the synopsis of a speech delivered by the president of our agricultural college, a most splendid man, a learned man, a man of great ability and with splendid education and experience in farming. He has this to say:

Good farming is the best insurance against crop failure. Farming is a business. It requires a better business head, a man of broader vision, to farm scientifically than to practice in any other profession.

That is a statement said to have been made by President Worst, of the Agricultural College of North Dakota.

Mr. President, if this is true, why should we look upon this matter in such a narrow way? Why should we look upon this industry as one that is being carried on by a lot of uneducated, ignorant men, who do not know any more than just how to hold the plow? I believe, sir, that if we pass the so-called Lever bill we should change the section of the bill which provides that three-fourths of this appropriation shall be used for field tests. I do not remember if the appropriation is contained in the first section. I will ask the Senator from Georgia in what section is embodied the provision that 75 per cent of the appropriation shall be used for field tests?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that is the third section. That was a provision put on in the other House, the Senator will remember. That was not in the original bill as I introduced it in the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, that is the very reason why I am making these few observations, in the hope that those Sena-

tors who are present to hear me will be willing to help me in changing that provision.

For years, Mr. President, we have been trying to change our methods of farming, and right here is a provision taking 75 per cent of the entire appropriation to be used for something that the farmer is trying to get away from.

It is not true that there is a shortage of farm products in this country; it is not true that the high cost of living is due to the high prices of agricultural products. In my town we have as good a market as can be found anywhere in the western country, and yet last fall we were compelled to sell our wheat as low as 67 cents per bushel; we had to sell our oats at 20 cents per bushel; we received from 30 to 32 cents per bushel for barley, and I presume that those who drink beer pay the same price as heretofore to those patriotic brewers who were here about a year ago and who were making such clamor all over the country against the high cost of living. I suppose that they are receiving the same amount for their beer now that they did when they paid \$1.54 per bushel for barley. The other day, going through the city of Minneapolis, I stepped into a grocery store and asked the grocer, whom I have known for more than 30 years, a man who is still in that business, what reduction, if any, had been made in the price of cereals. To my astonishment I found that, with oats at 20 cents per bushel, Quaker Oats in packages were selling at the same price that they were when we received 52 cents per bushel—not a reduction of a single cent. I found, to my surprise, that Corn Flakes, Pettijohn's Breakfast Food—in fact, all the cereals—are selling at the same price now that they were a year ago, when the price of grain was double what it is to-day; and yet the people in the cities believe, and honestly so, that the high prices paid for the farm products is the cause of the high cost of living.

If you want to help the farmer, if you want to help the people of the country, do something for them that will aid distribution. If those of you who live in the cities and are complaining because of the high cost of living will help us to devise some method whereby we can distribute all this immense amount of products that are now going to waste, you will be benefited; you will get your products at a lower cost, and the farmer will get a fair and reasonable price for the products of his labor.

Mr. President, the matter of greatest importance to the farmer and to the country is not in showing the farmer how to farm, but the great question before the country, so far as agriculture is concerned and so far as the comfort and enjoyment of the people who depend upon the farming industry are concerned, is how to develop methods whereby the farmer can receive a fair price for his products, and to facilitate distribution in such a way that the public may receive the products of the farm at reasonable prices.

Millions of bushels of vegetables go to decay in certain sections of our country, while in other sections the public is hungry for them. In my State, North Dakota, thousands and thousands of acres of potatoes were not dug, but were left in the ground for fertilizer. Because they were selling at prices that would not pay for the labor, there would have been an absolute loss in taking them out of the ground, and so they were left there to decay. At the same time I found right here in the city of Washington that potatoes were selling for \$1.10 a bushel, although in North Dakota we could not receive 15 to 25 cents a bushel; yet the farmer is being charged with direct responsibility for the high cost of living.

Ah, Mr. President, this is a serious proposition. I want, so far as I am able, to convince the Senate that it is not true that there is a scarcity of farm products in the United States. It is not true, sir, that the farmer is the cause, directly or indirectly, of the high cost of living.

Mr. President, it was with reluctance and a good deal of hesitancy that I began to make these observations upon this bill. In the first place, I know the meaning of the bill; I know, sir, that there is a powerful element back of it. Every banker in the cities, in the towns, and in the villages is demanding or asking for the passage of the bill. I am not going to say that they misunderstand it, but I am going to say that if they understood the provisions of this bill as I understand them they would not be so enthusiastic as they are in favor of its passage.

I am not willing to let it go unchallenged; I am not willing to have it said that we are passing a measure just for the benefit of the farmer. It would not be fair to the country to pass any measure that would benefit one industry at the expense of another; but I believe, sir, that if you want to do something for the country you must commence to educate the boy and the girl. It is too late to educate the old farmer. His mind is settled, his ideas are fixed, and you will not meet with very great success in going upon his farm and making field tests to show him how he will be better able to produce more grain per acre.



If you want to help the people of the United States you will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], because that is a measure wide enough in its scope to benefit not only one industry, but every industry in the United States. Oh, you may tell me that there is no necessity for vocational education or for instruction in the trades and home economics. Are you going to deny the farmer's daughter the opportunity of getting an education in home economics? Are you going to deny to the children of the men of the cities the right to receive some instruction in the trades and in the vocations which are absolutely necessary to carry on the great industries of this country? I care not where these men may be located or where they may live, when you have taken their boys or their girls and given them an education in the vocations, in the trades, or in home economics, you have increased their efficiency, you have done something for the people of our country.

The Senator from Georgia is perhaps as well qualified to talk upon this subject as any man in the Senate. I have not tried, Mr. President, to express any theory of my own or to advance any new philosophy. I have simply called attention to a few facts which are practical in everyday life. I desire to repeat, in order to emphasize the fact, that there is as much need for vocational education and knowledge of the trades on the farm as anywhere else on earth, because the farmer, to be successful, must at least have some one in his family or some one on his farm who has knowledge and ability as a blacksmith, as a carpenter, and as a harness maker.

The farmer's wife certainly is expected to understand her duties as a housewife, and she has the absolute right to instruction in home economics as much as anyone else.

I did not expect to take up so much of the time of the Senate. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] reminds me, however, of something I have overlooked—that it is as difficult, and more so, to get servants to help do the housework as it is to get laborers to do the work on the farm. Farmers who are getting along in years and who find it difficult—and they all find it difficult—to have the work done on the farm, are anxious to sell their farms, not because they do not love farm work—because it is a delightful work if you are not worked too hard—but because it is impossible, under existing conditions, to take any recreation and enjoy the pleasure that every man and woman is entitled to whether in the city or in the country. It is impossible to get service either in the house or upon the farm.

For these reasons, Mr. President, if we are to pass a bill at all, I ask Senators to consider the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont upon its merits, and if they do, I believe they will incorporate it in the House bill or accept it in place of the House bill.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, agricultural education and education in the trades should go hand in hand. They are of equal importance. Our way of living in this day leads us to interchange the labor of the city and the labor of the country, both in the matter of seasons and in the effort to better conditions. Sometimes it drifts toward the country and sometimes toward the city. Our smaller places throughout the country are getting to be manufacturing places as well as the cities. So we have industrial pursuits and agricultural pursuits all mixed up, and there is no reason why they should not be treated upon a par.

I am therefore in favor of providing for education in the trades as well as for education in agriculture, both at the same time and in the same way.

There is another thing that is sometimes overlooked. That is that farming is no longer a matter of everyday drudgery. Farming to-day is done by machinery; and there is nothing so much needed on the farm to-day to make it profitable and to make farm life tolerable as that the farm people shall be educated in the trades.

Take the matter of engineering, for instance. It might be thought that that would never be practiced except in the cities. But to-day the traction engine is going all over the country, it is taking the place of the horse, and engineers are wanted everywhere.

Take the milling of the country. Not very far back it was confined to the cities and to places that had water power and to places where it was convenient to build steam mills. Nowadays the power is furnished by gasoline engines, which are being sold literally by the million to go to all parts of the country. It is necessary to have men who are skilled in the trades not only to operate those engines, but to operate all of the subsidiary machinery that goes with them.

So I think what we should do, Mr. President, is to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, and to pass it and the so-called Lever bill at the same time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	McLean	Sanders
Bankhead	Gamble	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Bradley	Gardner	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Brandeggee	Gronna	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Bristow	Guggenheim	Oliver	Smoot
Brown	Hitchcock	Overman	Stephenson
Bryan	Jackson	Owen	Swanson
Burnham	Johnson, Me.	Page	Thomas
Cañon	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Percy	Wetmore
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Perkins	Williams
Crawford	Kern	Perky	Works
Cullom	Lippitt	Pomerene	
Dillingham	Lodge	Richardson	
Fletcher	McCumber	Root	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the call of the roll 57 Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] to strike out section 10 of the proposed amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will not prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The roll will be called on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). In the absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] from the city I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and vote "nay."

Mr. GARDNER (when his name was called). Notwithstanding my pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE] I am at liberty to vote on this proposition. I vote "nay."

Mr. LIPPITT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. Not knowing how he would vote upon this question I withhold my vote.

Mr. RICHARDSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I wish to announce my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and therefore I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], and let my vote stand.

Mr. CUMMINS. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is absent from the Senate on public business.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE], who is absent on business of the Senate, and I withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (after Mr. GALLINGER had voted in the negative). The present occupant of the chair is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. As that Senator has not voted, the vote is withdrawn.

The result was announced, yeas 12, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—12.			
Ashurst	Burton	Perky	Smith, Ariz.
Bryan	Helskell	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.
Burnham	McCumber	Root	Thomas
NAYS—44.			
Bradley	Dixon	Kern	Perkins
Brandeggee	Fletcher	Lodge	Sanders
Bristow	Gamble	McLean	Simmons
Brown	Gardner	Martine, Va.	Smoot
Cañon	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Nelson	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	Newlands	Swanson
Crawford	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Thornton
Cullom	Johnston, Ala.	Page	Townsend
Cummins	Jones	Paynter	Wetmore
Dillingham	Kenyon	Percy	Works

## NOT VOTING—39.

Bacon  
Bankhead  
Borah  
Bourne  
Briggs  
Chamberlain  
Chilton  
Clapp  
Crane  
Cuberson

Curtis  
du Pont  
Fall  
Foster  
Gallinger  
Gore  
Jackson  
Johnston, Tex.  
La Follette  
Lea

Lippitt  
Massey  
Myers  
O'Gorman  
Oliver  
Owen  
Penrose  
Poindexter  
Reed  
Richardson

Shively  
Smith, Md.  
Smith, Mich.  
Smith, S. C.  
Stone  
Tillman  
Warren  
Watson  
Williams

So the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Georgia to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On page 16, of section 21, I move to strike out, beginning at the middle of line 15, the balance of section 21.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, line 15, after the numerals and the semicolon, strike out the remainder of the section in the following words:

But the total number of such agricultural high schools in any State shall not be less than 1 for each 15 counties nor more than 1 for each 5 counties or fraction of 5 counties. Any such agricultural high school shall be open to admission without tuition charges and upon the same conditions to all persons otherwise qualified as herein provided residing in the district in which such school is located; but such school may be supported and controlled by the State, or by the district in which it is located, or by a portion thereof.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I hope the amendment may not prevail.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to state why I think it is important that this amendment should prevail. The provision that I move to strike out undertakes to limit the size of the territory in which these high schools shall exist. It says that in no case shall there be less than 5 counties and in no case shall there be more than 15 counties. I think the authorities of the State ought to be allowed to determine the size of the territory covered by an agricultural high school.

The only effect of the amendment to strike out is to leave the size of the territory in which the agricultural high schools are to exist to the authorities of the State. I can not see any advantage in undertaking to determine it ourselves by counties. Some counties are very large and other counties are very small. Some States have very small counties and other States have very large counties. To say that no high school, no matter how small the counties, shall have over 15 counties, and that no high school, no matter how large the counties, should have less than 5 counties, it seems to me is an unnecessary interference with the plan of location of the high schools.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Georgia please suspend for a moment? The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WORKS. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The object of my motion is to free the bill from that objection. It does not in any sense lessen the appropriation for the agricultural high schools. It lets the agricultural high schools stand exactly upon the plan the bill provides, but it removes the limitations as to territory.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood the amendment as read by the Secretary to include also the last sentence of the section. Possibly that was a mistake.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That was a mistake. It is to strike out all down to the word "but."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to have the amendment stated again from the desk, so that we may know exactly what is proposed to be stricken out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, line 16, after the numerals and the semicolon, strike out down to and including the word "located" and the semicolon on line 23 in the following words:

But the total number of such agricultural high schools in any State shall not be less than one for each 15 counties nor more than one for each 5 counties or fraction of 5 counties. Any such agricultural high schools shall be open to admission without tuition charges and upon the same conditions to all persons otherwise qualified as herein provided residing in the district in which such school is located.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate for one minute on this matter. I will simply say that this bill has been submitted to the different States, and 35 of the different States have said that they approve this feature of the bill, or they have really approved the bill and have not objected to this feature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE. I now wish to withdraw that amendment with the consent of the Senate. May I be permitted to do so?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment having been amended, it would not be in order.

Mr. PAGE. I give notice that when the bill comes into the Senate I shall move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the Page bill in its entirety.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont as a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If no further amendments be proposed as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PAGE. I now move in the Senate, instead of the amendments as reported by the Committee of the Whole, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the Page bill in its entirety.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think that is a great mistake on the part of the Senator from Vermont. I hardly think it is treating justly those who have helped make this measure. He came in himself with the House bill; we perfected the House bill, and we put in the essence of his bill which was not contained in the House bill as an amendment to the House bill. Now, he goes back to his bill No. 3, abandons the amendments that we have just adopted, abandons the bill that we have adopted as in Committee of the Whole, and asks us to strike out the measure that we have perfected as in Committee of the Whole.

I only desire to let the Senate understand what his motion is, and upon agreeing to it I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Vermont will not press that amendment. I feel it is hardly just to those who have supported his proposed measure who are friends of the Lever bill and who assumed from statements he made that he was willing to accept the Lever bill as a part of his own measure. I certainly have acted upon the theory that the Senator from Vermont was willing to incorporate his bill and the Lever bill in one measure, and now to make a change at this time it seems to me is not wise and it is hardly just.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I wish to say that on the 17th day of January I made a motion to amend. After I had made that motion the Senator from Georgia came to me and asked me if we could not reach some compromise. It almost took my breath away when he came, and I said—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to correct the Senator. I did not ask the Senator to make a compromise.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I will retract what I said. I will say that I stood upon the other side of the Chamber and the Senator came to me, and that is what I understood him to say. I said, "Senator, I am very happy indeed to do this, because my friends on this side have urged me to make some compromise with Senator SMITH. I will meet you at your house and we will see if we can not agree upon some compromise." I did so, and when I came back into the Senate imagine my surprise when I found that that compromise had not been understood by the Senator from Georgia. We have found ourselves with a variety of changes of views here in regard to the amendment which I offered on the 24th day of January, as I supposed to meet the wishes and views of the Senator from Georgia. I find that I was mistaken.

Now, I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], because he has been a friend of this measure from the first, that Senate bill No. 3 and the Lever bill are almost identical, the difference being that the Lever bill appropriates \$3,480,000 and Senate bill No. 3, \$3,000,000. I would be quite willing that in conference any amendment should be made that was thought best, but for the time being I find that I have



embarrassed my friends here by offering the amendment, which I certainly did in good faith to meet, as I supposed, the views of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. I understood Friday afternoon that he contemplated offering the Page bill, commencing at section 10, as an amendment to the Lever bill. I understood that that was to be the method of procedure. If I mistake not he gave me marked out what he purposed to offer as an amendment, commencing at section 10. It was to be offered as an amendment to the Lever bill, and it would go on that bill as an amendment. I am frank to say that it was my purpose to vote that that amendment should go on the Lever bill. But to come in now and offer it as a substitute, when the House of Representatives has passed the Lever bill, and we have perfected it, to throw out our entire work and offer a substitute, it seems to me is not acting in good faith with those who were working for the Page bill, and it is not wise to do it.

I understand that the Lever bill is a part of the Page bill, and after section 10, as amended, it includes all that the Senator desires.

It appears to me that the right course to pursue for those of us who have been cooperating is to continue the method of cooperation we have been following. Why should the House of Representatives be slapped in the face? They sent this bill here for our consideration. The purpose is to get legislation and not the mere prestige of having a bill with a different name attached to it. It seems to me the right course for us to pursue is to stand by the amendment as we understood it was to be offered and as it has been adopted.

Then the bill can properly be considered as the product of both the House and the Senate. If you want to accomplish this legislation—if we are anxious to bring the benefits to the country—the right way to do it promptly and efficiently is to amend the Lever bill and let the Lever bill stand with the portions of the Page bill desired as an amendment to that bill.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I simply repeat myself when I say that I consented to the amendment offered by me on the 24th day of January with a good deal of reluctance as to many of its features, but being urged, as I was by the friends of the measure on this side, to reach some compromise with the Senator from Georgia, if possible, I consented to amendments to which I did not fully subscribe. As far as I understand the matter, the arrangement, if one was made—I will withdraw that because the Senator from Georgia says there was no arrangement—the proposal which I made or which we made, it makes no difference, was disagreed to because the Senator from Georgia came in here and notified the Senate that he was opposed to the amendment which I offered on January 24 as a substitute measure. Having made that offer in good faith as a compromise and having had that compromise repudiated, I now wish to say to the Senate that I have spent two years in perfecting this bill and I believe it is right, and inasmuch as that compromise was repudiated, I hope the Senate will pass the Page bill in its entirety without the change of a comma, and when we get into conference I will be as square as anyone in trying to reach legislation. I believe that—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will allow me to finish the sentence, I believe that the Lever bill and the Page bill are identical except in some very few minor particulars.

If it was not so, I would say that it was absolutely improper for me to take the course I am pursuing. But inasmuch as it is simply a matter of words and a matter of construction, the material points of the Lever bill and the Page bill being the same, I hope the Senate will now pass the Page bill in its entirety without the change of a single comma.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator from Vermont will not insist on his motion. I believe the Senators on this side will feel that they have been misled, and misled by the Senator from Vermont. I am sure that is the way I feel about it.

I listened very closely to the Senator's speech at the time he offered his bill as a substitute for the Lever bill. On two separate occasions during his argument the Senator stated that he had incorporated in his bill the Lever bill, without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i."

I am in favor of the Lever bill and I am in favor of the principle of the balance of the bill of the Senator from Vermont, although I think it is rather crudely drawn, and it ought to be redrafted. I want to be sure that we will get some legislation, and I think it would be unwise for us to materially amend the Lever bill in whatever bill we may pass here. I

trust the Senator from Vermont will not insist upon his motion.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from North Carolina is acting under a misapprehension when he supposes that in my proposed amendment I am materially changing the Lever bill. There are some few minor differences, and only a few.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the changes are immaterial, why should the Senator ask us now to take a different measure from that which he offered as a substitute in the beginning, with the positive and repeated assurance that he did not change the Lever bill in any particular, either as to letter or as to punctuation?

Mr. PAGE. I can only say I believe the amendment of January 24 was somewhat crude, because it was drawn in a good deal of haste. I wish to say that so far as the original bill is concerned it has been drawn with the greatest care and every detail looked after. I believe the Page bill, Senate bill No. 3, as originally before the Senate January 17, is a perfected measure. I am far from certain that the new bill is; and I simply say that, inasmuch as they reach the same conclusion substantially, I would rather have the original bill passed than to take the chances of an imperfect bill, which I think may have been drawn in consequence of the proposed arrangement with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. I understand the Senator from Vermont offered an amendment which he had printed some days ago?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. No; the amendment has not been agreed to. Do I understand the Senator has withdrawn that amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; the amendment has been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole and reported to the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, his amendment was agreed to, and as I understand the parliamentary situation, after we come into the Senate he changes his program in the Senate from what he followed as in Committee of the Whole. If we vote against his bill as a substitute it still gives us an opportunity to vote for that amendment as adopted in the Senate. So if we vote down the bill he offers as a substitute—the Lever bill, with the amendment made—and following, section 10 will still be before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, it would be most unfortunate if any misunderstanding exists between the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Vermont which would result in a confusion in the consideration of this bill as to some of us who have not kept up with it as closely as our duty requires, largely upon the faith we had in those two Senators. I believed that the progress which was made in maturing the bill has been in the direction of an adjustment that would be satisfactory; and if it were not, it left the bill in such a condition that it might be perfected in the conference committee. Unless the matter is in dispute between the two Houses it would not be subject to the jurisdiction of that committee.

As I understand what has transpired here within the last few days, there has been an effort made to pick out from the two bills the merits of both and unite them in a common bill, and that that end has been substantially attained in the report that was made by the Committee of the Whole to the Senate.

I would not like to differ with my worthy friend from Vermont on a question of recollection about a matter that would be material if a dispute should arise over it; but many of us, as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], have been very agreeable witnesses to the fact that this harmonious condition existed between himself and the Senator from Georgia.

Now, if we vote to strike down the Lever bill with all the wholesome amendments that have been added to it by the action of the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and to take up the original Page bill, it would require us to familiarize ourselves a little more with that particular bill than would otherwise be the case. A situation therefore has been created that would take some of us by surprise, or at least find us in a state of unpreparedness, which would not otherwise exist had the two bills been projected from the beginning.

I am willing to yield my judgment to the Senator from Vermont on this particular measure, but in view of what has transpired I feel somewhat committed to vote against his proposition to submit his bill as an entirety in its original form. I feel like I should vote to ratify by the action of the Senate the amendments that have been reported from the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I regret the Senator from Vermont should suggest that any agreement between himself and myself in any way was not carried out. I hesitate about referring to matters that took place in private. I will only do so to this extent: I will state that the Senator from Vermont had for a number of weeks been urging me to have a private conference with him with reference to his bill, and finally he even suggested that he would call at my house, which I, of course, invited him to do. I was glad to see him there, and for several hours the subject was discussed, and I expressed certain criticisms with reference to the bill and suggested certain modifications of it. The Senator from Vermont made some modifications in the bill, and I explained to him that I did not mean even then that I could support the entire measure as he had redrafted it, although with two small exceptions this morning I reached the conclusion that I would vote for the majority of the provisions that he put into his amendment.

I want to state just what my attitude with reference to the matter is. I am deeply interested in seeing some legislation passed at this session. I begin with what we term the Lever bill. I am exceedingly anxious to see that bill passed, as the House has already passed it. If we can not get anything more than it, I prefer it to nothing.

I would be glad to see also added a provision starting the work of vocational education; I would be glad to see a provision starting the contribution to the agricultural high schools; and I would be glad to see a provision contributing something to the normal schools for instruction in industrial work.

That I did not agree to the entire measure as the Senator from Vermont presented it is true, and I do not now approve it as a whole. I do not believe we can possibly get it as a whole, and I do not think the Senate expects it. I think the Senate to-day in voting for it looks to see it improved and perfected in conference.

Now, what have we done to-day? What has been the result of the work we have been engaged on for a number of days? We have been trying to prepare a bill we hoped we might pass. We begin by taking the bill which the House has already passed. That is their idea of agricultural-extension work. We made a few small amendments to it, and we prepared to go back to the House, saying "We agree with you on your measure; we are taking no substantial issue with you on the measure you have approved; but we have added some amendments, and we invite you to come and join us in adding these amendments to the measure which you matured and passed."

That is what we did as in Committee of the Whole. We adopted those amendments, and those amendments which we adopted, going beyond what I thought it was advisable to adopt, cover practically the whole of the vocational work that was contemplated in the original Senate bill No. 3. We have added that vocational work to the House extension bill. We voted on it, and after we have acted upon it; after we have discussed it for days; after we have made a few amendments to it—not very material; after the two pieces of work have been put together, starting with the House bill and following on with the vocational bill of the Senator from Vermont, when we come into the Senate the Senator from Vermont asks us to repudiate the work of the Committee of the Whole and go back and take up a bill that we have not read, and which has not been considered at all in these days of work that we have been putting upon this measure. If we take that course, we shall take the best course we could pursue to kill the whole measure. As, I believe, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has said, we practically slap the House in the face.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Some of us were not present all of the time, and I think we would be gratified if the Senator from Georgia would explain to us wherein the amendment now offered by the Senator from Vermont differs from the bill as perfected in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would have to take it and read it all over and study it in order to do that. I do not know exactly.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Vermont says there is practically no difference.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, if that is true, why not adhere to what we have been working on for three or four days?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not giving my own opinion one way or the other. I am simply asking if the Senator can show us wherein there is a difference?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not. I would, as I have said, have to take the bill up and restudy it. I have had my attention given for the past three days to the details of the measure

before the Senate; I have had my attention given to the extension work of the House bill; and I have dismissed from my mind the other measure so far as it was contained in the original Page bill, No. 3.

Mr. McCUMBER. There seemed to be some objection, Mr. President, on the other side to the amendment because it was abandoning the House bill. Well, every amendment abandons it to some extent, and as amendments have been put in the bill in Committee of the Whole, I can not see the force of the claim of abandonment, because the bill will still remain the House bill, bearing the House number, acted upon in the Senate in either instance as a House bill, or the Lever bill, amended.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The proposition now of the Senator from Vermont is to strike everything out of the House bill but the title, to add a new title, and to substitute for it Senate bill No. 3, that we have not had under consideration as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McCUMBER. But it would still be the House bill, bearing the House number, and would hold its place and occupy a position as the House bill. That would not change it and make it a Senate bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It would have the number of the House bill, with nothing in it that the House put into it.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the broad statement has been made here, and has been made several times, that this is not only an abandonment of the House bill, but that it strikes out everything that is contained in that bill. On the contrary, I understood that this amendment includes the provisions of the House bill substantially as they passed the House. If that be so, it is simply an addition to the work that has been done by the House, and it is in no sense an abandonment of the House bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. You will have to take it up and study it to find out whether it is or not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The statement made by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] leads me to ask the Senator from Georgia if he will not state to the Senate the essential differences between these two bills as they deal with extension departments, which have already been established under the law.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am not prepared, without some lengthy attention to the matter, to do so. I have dismissed the provisions of Senate bill No. 3 from my mind for quite a length of time. I have been devoting my attention to helping perfect the bill as it was passed in the other House, and I have been studying that bill to the exclusion of the other. I would have to go back to it and study it again in order to do what the Senator from Wisconsin requests.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not mean, Mr. President, in all details, but just simply that the Senator from Georgia state to us the essential differences. I have no doubt, from the study which the Senator from Georgia has made of these two measures, of his ability to clearly place before the Senate those differences.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think I could mention two or three. The amount of the appropriation is different in the two bills. There is a provision in the House bill that nothing contained in that bill shall interfere with the demonstration work now being done by the Department of Agriculture, which we perfected here so as to provide that it should not interfere with certain work in the line of plant industries. In the House bill there is a provision as to the way in which the fund is to be used that is not contained in the Senate bill. The details of the plan of handling the money and the description of the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to the matter are somewhat different. I think it is worked out more in detail in the House bill than it is as contained in the original Page bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Georgia whether it be true, or not, that the provision in the Page bill covering the subject of the Lever bill is found in section 7?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I therefore suggest, if the Senator from Georgia can not state the differences, that the Secretary read the Lever bill and then read section 7 of the Page bill. We can all tell, then, what are the differences.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I infer from the debate that it was the understanding of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] when



he introduced the amendment that was adopted as a substitute for the Lever bill that he had reached an agreement of some kind with the friends of the Lever bill in the Senate, but it appears that that was a misunderstanding, and that the friends of the Lever bill now seem to be opposed to the amendment; that they did oppose it and voted against it. I happened to be absent when the vote was taken, but there was a division. The consequence is that, unless we adopt the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Vermont and go back to his original bill, which was the bill considered by the committee, the bill upon which he has worked, as he says; which he has had mere or less before the Senate for the last year, at least, and on which he delivered his speech of June 5, 1912—unless we go back to that original bill and take that, we will be passing an amendment here with which nobody is satisfied.

The Senator from Vermont says that he made the concessions which were contained in that amendment in order to reach an agreement with the friends of the Lever bill, but it seems that he failed in that object. The Senator from Vermont prefers the original bill to the amendment. The Senator from Georgia is not satisfied with the amendment. So it would seem to be the reasonable thing to do, if the Senate, as is evident, is in favor of vocational education—of education in the trades and industries, and of providing for Federal aid to agricultural schools—to adopt the bill which has received the greatest care and consideration on the part of the committee and of the Senator from Vermont, which includes all of the provisions which have been suggested by him, and to allow those provisions to go to conference, so that they may be considered there.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask what feature is there in the original bill No. 3 which has not been put on by amendment? Can the Senator from Washington state?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The amendment is almost identical with the bill, except as to minor differences. The title is different; it drops the bill which has come to be known as the Page bill; it deprives, in a measure, the Senator from Vermont of the credit of the legislation by dropping his bill and taking up an amendment. I understand it is true that in its principal features the amendment which has been adopted is identical with the original bill, but the Senator from Vermont prefers the form of the original bill; he prefers the manner in which it is expressed. It has been considered by the committee. I confess that I have not had an opportunity to consider the details of the form of these several bills, and I am simply speaking about the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves—that we have adopted an amendment here which has not received the favor of either side to the controversy as between the Lever bill and the Page bill. The Page bill is conceded by everybody to contain substantially the Lever bill, also a number of additional features. We should adopt that bill and allow the matter to go to conference, so that the form of this legislation, the substance of which the Senate seems to have agreed to—there are very few here who are opposed to it, and it is a question of the form in which it is guarded, the manner in which these appropriations are to be expended—so that the form of the legislation can be finished and perfected in conference between the two Houses.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. ROOT. I rose to ask the Senator from Washington if he would point out, or perhaps the Senator from Vermont might point out, those portions of the original bill No. 3, which we speak of as the Page bill—the original, I mean, which he now moves to substitute—which reproduce the provisions of the Lever bill? I ask, Mr. President, because I am much interested in perfecting our system of conveying information about agriculture to the farmers of the country by means of these extension departments and field demonstrations. I think that it is just as important for this country now to increase the productivity of agriculture as it ever was to increase the productivity of manufacturing when the original protective tariff was adopted.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. ROOT. Excuse me for one moment. I should not like to have any substitute adopted here which leaves out the practical and effective provisions of the bill which the Senator from Georgia has been urging. On the other hand, I am a very firm believer in the importance of vocational education. I am not convinced that the Government of the United States ought to go into that, and I am far from being convinced that the scheme which has been evolved here for imposing control by the Government of the United States upon the secondary schools of the country is a wise scheme. I have very grave

doubt about that; but I certainly do not want to vote upon this great mass of provisions without knowing the relation of one to the other. If the Senator will point out what parts of the Page bill, which he now moves to substitute, reproduce the provisions of the Lever bill, I shall be very much obliged to him.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ROOT. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. I should like to ask the Senator from New York this question: No one denies that we are all interested in the productivity of agriculture and individually we desire a large yield; but I should like to have the Senator from New York point out to me where the farmer is particularly benefited by the production of large crops, in every section of our country, so that we have a large surplus. In other words, is it not true that we have no means whereby the farmer can regulate the price of his products at all, while, on the other hand, the manufacturer, whether he produces much or little, fixes the price of his product—something that the farmer can not do?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, answering the—

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I feel bound to answer the question of the Senator from North Dakota, if the Senator from Vermont will allow me.

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. ROOT. All the farmers whom I have ever known—and I have known a great many—would rather get 28 bushels of wheat to the acre than 14; they would feel better about it. The fact that the farmer individually can not regulate the prices of his products is no reason why his farm should not be made as productive as possible. The demand for food products in this country and throughout the world is increasing continually; the increased demand is continually increasing the prices which the farmer receives for his products; and as that demand continues to increase with the increase of population, the farmer stands to receive continually remunerative prices for his product, and, in my judgment, that increasing demand and the continuance of remunerative prices keep pace with the best improvement that is possible on the farms of this country.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator from New York misunderstood my question. I confess that I am as much in favor as is anyone else of increasing the productivity of our soil, and so, I believe, are the farmers of this country, but what I should like the Senator from New York, or any other Senator, to point out to me is the advantage that the farming industry or the farmer has received by the production of a large surplus. Is it not true that when this country has a large crop prices are reduced in proportion to the size of the crop? In 1910, for instance, there was a small crop all over the country, and in 1911 we had only a fair crop, but the farmers made money in 1911, while in 1912, with overproduction, there was practically a loss to the agricultural interests of the United States.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. Root] has asked me to point out the differences between the Lever bill and the Page bill, so far as what is known in the two bills as college extension work is concerned.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand the Senator from New York to inquire as to the difference between the substitute which the Senator from Vermont now offers and the bill which the Senate has agreed to as in Committee of the Whole. That is what I should like to know also.

Mr. PAGE. I was about to explain.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to know what difference there is between those two measures.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I asked rather for the similarity than the difference. I want to know where in the Page bill occur the provisions which are similar or which accomplish the same effect as the provisions which are in the Lever bill. I can not find them.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. PAGE. I should like to answer the Senator from New York for just a moment, if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. OWEN. Just a moment. It seems to me that the point which needs explaining is the extent to which the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole do not include the Page bill.

Mr. PAGE. I will be very happy to answer that question. In the first place, Mr. President, the Page bill gives \$3,000,000 to college extension work, \$3,000,000 to district agricultural

schools, \$3,000,000 to education in the rural communities, and \$3,000,000 to education in the cities. There are four \$3,000,000 appropriations. The Lever bill leaves out appropriations for industrial schools and adds \$480,000 to college extension work. I consented to that. I do not know that I now object seriously to it, but still it seems to me that the \$480,000 added by the Lever bill is more than ought to go to that feature of the work in consideration of what we have given to the other features.

Next, the Page bill from first to last provides that whatever the Federal Government shall do shall be matched by the States. The Lever bill does not do that. As to the \$10,000 to each State which is immediately forthcoming and available under the Lever bill, it is provided that the States may have that fund absolutely without duplicating it. That is so contrary to the entire principle of the Page bill that I only yielded to the amendment because I wished to get a reasonable compromise. Third, the Lever bill contains this provision:

Sec. 3. That all correspondence for the furtherance of the purposes of this act issued from the agricultural colleges to their agents or by the agents of the said extension departments thereof receiving the benefits of this act shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States free of charge for postage, under such regulations as the Postmaster General from time to time may prescribe.

This provision was originally in Senate bill No. 3, but after very careful discussion it was thought to be an unsafe and unwise provision to incorporate. I do not know how many protests I received from publishers of agricultural papers in this country, who said to me: "If you incorporate this provision into your bill, you will perhaps allow the agricultural colleges to begin to publish newspapers; they can publish anything; and they can have, and will have, an unfair advantage over the agricultural press of this country, which ought to have a fair show in the fight, and they will not have it if you say that all the agricultural colleges may have the right to send everything they wish through the mails free." As every Senator knows, under the present statute they already have the right to send free the periodicals which they issue regularly. I do not know how extensive that privilege is; but, be that as it may, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, after considering it, thought it best to exclude that provision. That provision comes back to us from the House in the Lever bill.

I do not regard that as a very unwise feature; and as a compromise measure I was willing to accept it. I do not regard it as particularly unwise to add half a million dollars to the appropriation. As a matter of compromise, I was willing to accept that. I do not particularly object to giving the money to the States without making them duplicate it with an appropriation from their own treasuries; but I think it is wrong; I do not believe it is the best way. I believe the Page bill is the better way; and so, having failed of a compromise, I now come to say that, whereas I yielded reluctantly to these measures because of a supposed compromise, the compromise having been repudiated, I now ask that the Page bill in its original simplicity be enacted.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I do not know or care anything about the compromises which have been made or the conferences which have been held. The Senator from Vermont has not answered the question. I will put it more distinctly. Where in the bill which he moves to substitute are contained the provisions which reproduce the same effect as the provisions of section 2 of the Lever bill?

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator from New York has before him the original amendment proposed by me on the 17th of January, or if he has the original Page bill, he will find in it this provision:

That for the support—

Mr. BRISTOW and Mr. CRAWFORD. Where is that?

Mr. PAGE. On page 6 of the amendment offered by me on January 17, or in section 7 of the original Page bill, Senate bill No. 3. That provision reads in this way:

Sec. 7. That for the support in each State college of agriculture and the mechanic arts of an extension department or division, the sum of \$640,000 annually, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913—

Let me explain that—

Mr. CRAWFORD. For what purpose is that?

Mr. PAGE. I will read further:

of which annual appropriation \$10,000 shall be allotted to each of the 48 States for the benefit of such extension departments; and for the maintenance of such extension departments, the additional sum of \$400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

And so on, until it reaches \$3,000,000. I do not need to read further, because it simply provides for the extension from year to year until \$3,000,000 is reached.

Mr. ROOT. What is to be done with it?

Mr. PAGE. It is for what is known as college extension work. If Senators will turn to the bottom of page 2 in the

original Senate bill No. 3, they will find what this work means. It is there described as follows:

Third. "Agricultural-extension department or division" shall mean a department or division which is established under the provisions of this act and under the direction of a State college of agriculture and the mechanic arts in any State, and which gives instruction and demonstrations in agriculture and home economics to persons not residing at said college nor at the district agricultural schools provided for in this act and which conveys or imparts to such persons information on such subjects through field demonstrations, publications, and otherwise.

That is almost the exact provision of the Lever bill; there is a difference in language; but, so far as the purpose of the bill is concerned, it is almost identical. It relates to work carried from the experiment stations to the adult farmer on the farm. It covers that in both bills. If Senators will recall the discussions we have been having here in the Senate for the last year, they will remember that the provisions of the Smith bill, so called because the Senator from Georgia last spring introduced into the Senate a bill substantially like the Lever bill, that the provisions of the Smith bill or the Lever bill are almost identical with the provisions of the Page bill, so far as college extension work is concerned.

If the bills were not substantially identical I could easily see the impropriety of my motion. But inasmuch as they are identical, or nearly so, and inasmuch as I believe the bill which I have introduced has been drawn with greater care and is better safeguarded than the amendment which was introduced here, as I understood, to meet a compromise, I now ask, because I believe it is the better bill, that the original bill be substituted.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. PAGE. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. I want to see if I am correct in my understanding. As I understand the Senator from Vermont, the practical difference is that the Lever bill provides for giving the franking privilege to the agricultural colleges and the schools that enjoy the benefit of these appropriations?

Mr. PAGE. An additional franking privilege.

Mr. BRISTOW. An additional franking privilege; and it also makes an appropriation from the Public Treasury which it does not require that the States shall meet with a like appropriation?

Mr. PAGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator permit an interruption there?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It seems to me section 31 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont cures that defect, because it specifically provides that a double amount of money must be provided by State or local taxation. That is the amendment which has been adopted in Committee of the Whole, and which the Senator now proposes to substitute for his original bill, which in Committee of the Whole he voluntarily withdrew, and upon the strength of which withdrawal many votes were secured for the bill.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to correct the Senator, because I know he desires to be absolutely correct. I said that under the amendment of January 24, which I offered, I had not changed so much as a comma. The provisions of the Lever bill do not provide that an equal amount shall be appropriated by the States; and as I understand—and I think the Senator from Georgia will agree with me—as the bill will be left if we pass it to-day as it came from the Committee of the Whole, there will not be required from the States an amount equal to the amount appropriated by the Federal Government.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me ask the Senator another question. Will not the bill which has been agreed upon in Committee of the Whole contain section 31, offered by the Senator himself?

Mr. PAGE. I do not know that I have offered any amendment to section 31.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator withdrew his original bill, Senate bill No. 3, and offered as an amendment to the pending bill everything following section 9. It is that which we have been discussing and that which we have finally agreed upon in Committee of the Whole. Section 31 of that amendment contains this provision:

But there shall in no case be disbursed under the terms of this act to any school or college out of moneys derived from the rural school department fund, the industrial school fund, the agricultural school fund, the college teachers' training fund, or the teachers' training fund, as provided by this act, more money than 50 per cent of the amount



which is supplied and expended during the same period for the same purpose for which such fund is to be expended out of either State and local or State or local public moneys.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the trouble with the Senator's conclusion there is that the feature pertaining to the college extension fund is not included in that list.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, as to three-quarters of the expenditures provided for in this bill, the provision is at least good?

Mr. PAGE. It is good as to practically all except the Lever appropriation of \$10,000 to the colleges. Under the Lever bill the appropriation of \$10,000 per year to the colleges is not to be duplicated by the States, while under the Page bill it is to be duplicated. In that respect I think the Page bill is the better.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator gave the impression that under the bill agreed upon in Committee of the Whole there was no obligation upon the States or the local communities to supply an equal amount of money. But this provision evidently covers the case as to three-quarters of the amount appropriated, and it is only in the case of one appropriation where that provision is not made.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to say that that was my understanding—that there was an appropriation in the bill as it was agreed to in the Committee of the Whole that the States were not required to meet with an equal amount. I did not understand that the States did not have to meet part of the appropriation, but that there was one appropriation which they did not have to meet, and that that was one of the differences.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But that was a matter which the Senator himself could have cured in Committee of the Whole, and can still cure by an amendment.

I want to renew my statement made a few minutes ago—that it seems to me, without any regard to a disagreement between the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Georgia, that the Senator from Vermont should in good faith carry out what he publicly agreed to here on the floor of the Senate on the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa. The Senator from Vermont used this language:

I will state my purpose in moving the amendment to the Lever bill, so called, H. R. 22871: For many months I have been trying to get action upon the original Senate bill No. 3. That action, as the junior Senator from Georgia well understands, has been postponed and objected to from time to time until he believes—and I do not know but that I agree with him in that belief—that to pass now the original bill, Senate bill No. 3, and send it to the House would probably mean that it would go into the Committee on Agriculture of that body, and that it would there die the death which comes to so many bills which we send over to the House toward the close of a session. \* \* \* If we are at this session of Congress to grant Federal aid to industrial education, it must be done by substituting Senate bill No. 3 for the House bill. In other words, Senators who are in favor of extending industrial education to the boy as provided by Senate bill No. 3 must vote for the amendment which I have offered, for it is probable that in no other way can we reach this legislation at this session. If the amendment which I have offered substituting the Page bill for the Lever bill is adopted, then the matter goes into conference, and out of that conference it is believed some bill carrying with it a measure of Federal aid to industrial education will result.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator right there for just a moment? That is my position at this time—that in order to get action at this session we must substitute the Page bill for the Lever bill, because then it will go into conference, and from that conference we can get out some kind of a bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will permit me to add a word, that was the Senator's original position. But about that time the Senator from Iowa took the floor, and suggested to the Senator from Vermont a method of simplifying the procedure by amalgamating the two bills. He did it in this way:

I think it would simplify matters very much if the Senator from Vermont would allow the bill presented by the Senator from Georgia to stand, inasmuch as he does not propose to change it, and simply offer as an amendment that part of his bill which deals with the vocational education and additional appropriations for agricultural education. I believe we would get along with it a little faster if that were done.

Then the Senator from Vermont said:

Mr. President, I am very anxious to adopt whatever is the best and most proper course here. My suggestion on the 24th instant was that I would offer the amendment which has been placed upon the desks of Senators this morning. But I recognize the fact that the Senator from Iowa is a warm friend of the whole measure, and I am rather inclined to accept his wishes and his views, if the Chair informs me that that is the proper parliamentary procedure.

Having given notice that I would introduce this amendment as a whole, I will ask, as a matter of parliamentary procedure, whether I may properly omit at this time from my proposed amendment the first nine sections, which really are identical with House bill No. 22871, and move to amend the House bill by adding to it all of that portion of the proposed amendment which follows section 9?

Thereupon the Chair naturally told the Senator from Vermont that it was his privilege to change his position, and he did

change it. We accepted the change, and we discussed the matter with the understanding that he had abandoned the original bill. No study has been placed upon the original bill since that time. We on this side have believed, and have voted with the Senator from Vermont in the belief, that he had abandoned the original bill, and had agreed to accept the suggestion made by the Senator from Iowa for the simplification of the matter.

It seems to me, after that has been done, that at least propriety, if not good faith, requires the Senator from Vermont to carry out the arrangement thus made in the open Senate.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. PAGE. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am not much interested in the different processes and maneuvers that have been resorted to in order to get the bill up to the present stage, but I am interested in what the bill does.

If the amendment which the Senator from Vermont now offers changes the bill which we passed in the Committee of the Whole so as to limit the franking privilege instead of extending it, and so as to require the States to put up funds whenever the Federal Government does, I want to vote for those two propositions. I do not care what the different understandings or misunderstandings have been, but I am interested in the substance of the legislation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will permit me, it would be an easy matter to amend the bill in that way, and I would be very glad to join him in that. But it would not be necessary, in order to accomplish that, to take up a completely new bill which the Senate has not even been considering as in Committee of the Whole, and which does contain other features.

Mr. BRISTOW. If there is any other feature, I should like to know what it is. I have been trying to find out the differences between the two measures. Up to this time these two differences have been suggested. Are there any others?

Mr. PAGE. There are. I should like to have Senators give their attention to this statement, because I know that upon this point there is considerable difference of opinion.

The Lever bill gives \$10,000 a year to each State. That makes a total of \$480,000. Senate bill No. 3, as drawn, gives \$640,000. Touching that particular feature, I want to say that the head of one of the colleges in Mississippi came to me and said: "Senator PAGE, if you knew the struggle we are making in the South to get along and give the negroes of the South some education along industrial lines you would say that we should have \$10,000 for each agricultural college rather than \$10,000 for each State." In other words, in States that have two agricultural colleges they ask that we give an added \$10,000.

That feature was objected to by some, including, I think, the junior Senator from Georgia. But after a time I went to him with statements from Senators from the South, and said: "Senator, there is a strong feeling on the part of some that the negro colleges in the South should share this appropriation with the white colleges." The Senator from Georgia said to me substantially this—I do not want to misquote him, but as nearly as I can remember he said: "If you want to give us that added \$10,000, I do not think we will object to it." So the Page bill, as drawn, gives the same amount to the negro colleges of the South that it gives to the white colleges. In other words, it gives \$160,000 more, being \$10,000 for each State having a negro college.

The Senator from Kentucky came to me and pleaded for that provision. He said: "You do not know how much we in Kentucky need to give industrial education to the negroes. Will you not aid me to get that provision in?" I said: "So far as I am concerned, Senator, I do not want to do anything that will imperil my bill; but if the Senator from Georgia and those who objected agree I will agree." I supposed I had the consent of the Senator from Georgia, so far as he was concerned, that this \$10,000 for the agricultural colleges should be included in my bill, and so it was put in. But it is omitted from the Lever bill.

I do not want to say which is right. I wish the Senate might decide upon that. But I want to say that that provision is exactly as it was left by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. I do not feel at liberty to emasculate the bill by changing those features, unless it be to effect a compromise which will prevent any disastrous results to these two bills—the Lever bill and the Page bill.

If I supposed Senate bill No. 3 were going to be imperiled, every Senator here knows I would yield to any kind of a compromise. But the facts are that the Page bill and the Lever bill coincide; and when they get into conference we can, from those two measures, produce a bill that I believe will meet per-

fectly the views of the Senate and will be at least a start in the great plan of Federal aid to industrial education.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. PAGE. With pleasure.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to ask the Senator if he has any less reason to-day for believing that the measure will be imperiled by insisting on original Senate bill No. 3 than he had a few days ago, when this same matter was up, and when he then thought it wise, in order to accomplish definite results, to accept the Lever bill, and to add to it the provisions of his bill? The situation to-day is not at all different from what it was then, it seems to me.

Let me say to the Senator that from the time he introduced the bill and I first gave it consideration I have been an advocate of Senate bill No. 3, known as the Page bill. I have been under the general impression that it included to a very large degree, and in a general way, the provisions of the House bill known as the Lever bill, and that it went still further. Believing, as I always have, that the great Department of Agriculture of our Government has for its chief function that of education, I have heartily favored the assistance provided in educational directions by both the Lever bill and Senate bill No. 3.

But there seems to be a difference of opinion as to whether or not the provisions covering that particular subject in Senate bill No. 3 are substantially the same as the provisions in what is known as the Lever bill that has passed the House. In order to avoid any difficulty on that score, particularly as long as the Senator has just reiterated what he has said over and over again—that his bill contains substantially the same provisions as the Lever bill—it seems to me that it is the safer proposition to accept the House bill and to add to it such provisions as we have agreed to as in Committee of the Whole, which provisions are the work and have been prepared under the direction and guidance of the Senator from Vermont.

There would then go to the conferees the measure as it passed the House, with certain additions; and it would be for them to determine which of those additions, if any, they would agree upon; and if they did not agree upon any of the additions, we would at least get a measure which has already passed the House, and which would then become a law. I appeal to the Senator—

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he has the slightest doubt that the bill, as I propose to amend it, would be the subject of a conference on the Lever bill, just as certainly as the Lever bill amended by the additional features of the Page bill?

Mr. FLETCHER. I confess, Mr. President, that in my judgment the measure would not then be in nearly so favorable a position, looking to definite results, as it would be if the Senator would accept the situation as it comes from the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to know why, Mr. President.

Mr. FLETCHER. Because there would go to the House an entirely new bill, not the Lever bill as it passed the House at all, not the Lever bill with amendments which are merely additions to the Lever bill. There would go to the House an entirely different measure, embodying different and varying propositions, which would be referred there to the conferees, and it would have to be all thrashed out over again. Delay would necessarily ensue; and in my judgment there would be very serious doubt about it ever coming to any result at this session of Congress if that should be done.

As a friend of the measure, originally known as Senate bill No. 3, as a friend of both these propositions, I most respectfully urge upon the Senator from Vermont to leave this matter as it came from the Committee of the Whole.

I am not quite clear in my own mind about it, although it has been assumed in debate here, but I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont on the 24th of January is now before the Senate as a part—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It has been adopted.

Mr. FLETCHER. It has been adopted; and although my recollection was that the Senator offered to withdraw that amendment in Committee of the Whole, I was not quite sure whether he did it or not. There was some confusion at the time.

Mr. PAGE. No; I did not.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator understand that his amendment offered on the 24th of January is the matter now before the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. PAGE. I should like to answer the Senator from Florida for just a moment. Then I shall be very glad to yield the floor to the Senator from Mississippi.

I made concessions, Mr. President, which I did not believe improved the bill. I believe the bill as it was originally drawn is a great deal the better bill. I have submitted my reasons for believing it is the better bill. When I consented to introduce the amendment of January 24, it was with the full expectation that I had reached a compromise, and that as a result of making the surrender and reaching a compromise we would have no opposition to the bill.

But the Senator will remember that all the afternoon objection after objection came up to the bill. So, finally, I feel, and I think the Senator will feel for me, that I have a right to say that now I should prefer to have the better and the stronger bill go to conference. If I thought it could not go into conference—if that is the parliamentary situation, and I am assured that it is by good parliamentarians—I should not object to anything. I want it to go to conference.

The language which I used, and which the Senator from Nebraska has quoted, conveys my exact sentiments. If I thought the bill could not go to conference, I would yield almost anything. But I am told that it can go to conference under the amendment I have offered, and believing that my last amendment is the better amendment, and that it more nearly perfects the bill, I should like to have it go in that way.

I believe that in the amendments that were hastily prepared to meet the views of the Senator from Georgia there were some things that were drawn too hastily. We have found now some very important defects in them. But the original bill, I believe, is perfect, so far as that is concerned. I believe every matter of technical language has been carefully provided for. It has been submitted to the best technicians I know in that line, and the bill has been approved by the educators of the country in the form in which I now ask it to go through. I hope Senators will not object to supporting my amendment, for I believe I have the better bill now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator continues to repeat that he introduced his amendment under a misapprehension, believing that a compromise had been reached. I desire to state that if he understood that agreement was by me he understood it in spite of the fact that I told him expressly that I would not agree to it. Nothing that I said justified him in believing that I intended to support it. I declined to agree to support it when the Senator came to my house. I told him as he left my house that I could not agree in advance to support it. I told him before he introduced it here that I had not agreed to support it.

I am a little weary of hearing upon the floor that the Senator introduced it under a misapprehension, if he means to refer to myself, as I have told him that I had not agreed to it often enough to exclude the justification of a misapprehension.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I did not mean to say that the Senator had told me one thing or the other. I simply say, and I repeat it, that I supposed the Senator and myself had reached an agreement. It seems that I am wrong about it, so I do not reiterate that. I simply say that acting upon that supposition I introduced my amendment of January 24. Had I not supposed that we had reached an agreement, I should not have introduced it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, after we came into the Senate the Senator from Vermont introduced the amendment, knowing that I did not agree to it. He continued to press it here, knowing that I did not agree to it. He accepted the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], knowing that I had not agreed to it. I stated on the floor, in reply to a question of the Senator from Iowa, that I could not agree to it. I finally went a great deal further in agreeing to it in my votes to-day than I thought I could at the time it was introduced.

I have been trying to help to-day to get the measure into such a shape that we could pass something. If the Senator persists, I think perhaps the whole thing had better go over for the session, and let us start over again at the next session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am afraid there is a good deal of amour propre on both sides of this matter. I take it that what the Senate is seeking is results, and not names, and yet now and then names have a great deal to do with things.

I know something about the procedure at the other end of the Capitol. The two Houses will be further apart, actually as well as nominally, if it is announced to the 400 Members of the House of Representatives—a body so numerous that they



have not time to study all questions in detail—that the Senate has rejected the House bill, and has substituted for it the Senate bill. Immediately they will say to one another: "What do you know about the Page bill?" "Not much; virtually nothing." "Our bill was considered in committee. What course shall we take?" Immediately it will be concluded that the best course will be to send the bill to the Committee on Agriculture of the House, in order that that committee may study the bill and report it back to the House with some enlightening information as to the differences between the two bills.

This is a very small body, composed of ninety-odd Members. Yet, to-day, we have seen the best-informed Senators on the floor rise and ask for information as to the difference between two bills which have been pending here for—I will not undertake to say how long. There is the real danger in this situation.

Of course, I understand, and everybody understands, how two very honorable men may meet and discuss matters, and one may say: "I am of the opinion that this ought to be done." The other one says: "I do not know but that I could agree with you about that." The first one says: "I think this ought to be done." Then the other, having heard what the first is willing to concede, will say: "I will agree to that." When you get through you have a mutual misunderstanding; and yet both part with no agreement on the part of either to do precisely what the other desires. In fact, I think it is well, when men meet together and begin to talk about a difference, to remember always that the conversation, as a rule, is tentative.

I ask the attention of the Senator from Vermont. I am not asking him a question, but I am afraid if you go to the House of Representatives, as numerous a body as it is, as crowded with all sorts of business as it is, four times as much crowded as we are in every way, and say to them that you have substituted for a House bill a Senate bill, unless you are able to say to them that the Senate bill is identical with the House bill or identical except for immaterial variations, the course taken by the House would be to send the bill to the committee instead of sending it at once to conference. We are within 30 or 35 days of adjournment, and I do not believe I would take that chance. The point I want to make is that the two Houses will be further apart actually, because they are nominally further apart, if you take that course.

I confess with some degree of shame that I have had my mind lately dwelling more upon some other matters than upon this measure, and I really do not know just how far the Committee of the Whole adopted the provisions of the Lever bill and the provisions of the Page bill, but if they have substantially included the essential parts of both bills in one bill, then I have no doubt about the fact that the prospect of securing actual legislation would be much better if the matter were sent to the House in that way.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was out of the Senate when the motion was made. Is this a motion to substitute, striking out all after the enacting clause?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the method of doing business in the Senate he understands better than I. We have nothing before us immediately, but the Senator from Vermont gave notice, I understand, that when the bill got into the Senate—

Mr. LODGE. We are in the Senate now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He would substitute the Page bill for the Lever bill.

Mr. LODGE. We are in the Senate now, but what I wanted information about, because I was out of the Chamber, was the question whether the motion is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Page bill.

Mr. LODGE. If that is the motion, of course that takes both bills into conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course it does.

Mr. LODGE. It retains the House number.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon; it takes both bills into conference under the House rules unless a motion is made and carried to send it to the Committee on Agriculture. If you take 400 men and they do not know what the Senate bill is, they are not going to rush it into conference. A conference in the Senate is bad enough, but a conference at the other end is worse, because there are 400 Members; things have to be understood, have to be explained to them, and men are not willing to take up an entirely new bill and have it voted upon under a proposition that on amendment numbered 5 of the Senate the House conferees disagreed, and on amendment numbered 3 the House conferees agree, and so on. The House insists upon keeping its business in its own hands upon a few occasions when it can, and when a matter goes to conference it really can not do so.

Mr. LODGE. I thought from what the Senator said the motion was to substitute the Senate bill. If it were substituting the Senate bill for the House bill, it would go back as a Senate bill with the Senate number, and of course it would go to the committee and would not go into conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is a distinction, but it is not a difference, and it is the difference to which the House will, in my opinion, pay attention, not the mere distinction.

Mr. LODGE. But I mean if it was a substitution, then it would go back, of course, as a Senate bill, and would go to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. By striking out all after the enacting clause it would be a Senate bill with a House number.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So, when it goes back to the House from the Senate and the Senate has stricken out all of the House bill except the enacting clause and substituted for it a Senate bill, unless you can assure the parties in charge of the bill, and not only can but are willing to assure the House, that the two bills are either identical or there are immaterial differences, the Members of the House will want to have it examined by a House committee. They are not willing to act merely upon the deliberations of the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Mississippi if the 400 Members of the House will feel that they know anything more about the Page amendment when it is put in divers amendments, as it has been in Committee of the Whole already, than when put in a single amendment in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Absolutely they will, because, in the first place, they have been discussing one bill, and whether they will know or not, they will think they know. This is a psychological problem, and they will think they know, and thinking that the House bill has come back passed by the Senate with certain amendments, they will be willing to let the House bill go to the conferees in order that the differences between the two Houses concerning the amendments may be settled. In other words, the essential thing in their minds is, if the House bill is passed, then there will be no trouble about sending it to conference at once.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and insert a substitute.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I then vote against the proposition now before the Senate made by the Senator from Vermont, and I desire to state very briefly why I will do it.

I have been for the Senate bill, prepared in a large measure by the Senator from Vermont, and for which he is entitled to the greatest possible credit from the beginning until he entered upon this discussion. I think it was I who first suggested to the Senator from Vermont that in order to make certain of some legislation upon the subject he offer Senate bill No. 3 as a substitute when the House bill came before the Senate.

I know nothing about the conference between the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Georgia, and I do not care to inquire into it. I only know that at one time the Senator from Vermont stated that he understood they had reached an agreement, and that the Senator from Georgia rejected that construction of their conference. My interest in this special matter was after that time, after the Senator from Georgia had indicated that he had entered into no agreement with the Senator from Vermont, after we all understood that the Senator from Vermont offered the substitute which bears the date of January 24, 1913. That substitute is a reproduction in its first nine sections of the House bill. There is no change whatsoever. The remaining sections are a reproduction of Senate bill No. 3, with the changes that had been made by the Senator from Vermont at the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia. He so declared.

I was intensely anxious that nothing should happen that would impair the chance for successful legislation, and therefore when the Senator from Georgia arose and said to the Senator from Vermont that he hoped he would offer that part of his substitute beginning with section No. 10 as an addition to the House bill, the House bill having been reproduced in terms in the first nine sections of the substitute in the hands of the Senator from Vermont, it seemed to me that we would be surer of that legislation if the suggestions of the Senator from Georgia were accepted, and I arose, caring not a whit whether the legislation came from the House or whether it came from the Senate. It makes no difference to me where it originates or who originates it. I simply desire the legislation itself. It seemed to me that the easiest and the surest way of reaching our end was to attach what might be called the Page part of this legislation to the Lever part of the legislation, if I may so designate a House bill and a Senate bill. I so declared, and

expressed the hope that the Senator from Vermont would adopt that course.

The Senator from Vermont did adopt that course, and so declared from his seat. He not only so declared, but he did offer these parts of his bill from section 10 through to the end as an amendment to the House bill. I know that he did that in perfect good faith. I know that he has but one desire, and that is to secure wise legislation upon this subject. But having embarked upon this course at my suggestion, he may feel himself at liberty to depart from that course, but I do not. I think we ought to adhere to the plan which resulted in the offer of the sections after No. 10 of the Senate bill. I believe so because there is a certain good faith which requires us to adhere to that course, and, second, because I believe it will tend to allay the irritation which little by little is creeping into the Senate upon the whole matter.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from Vermont will not persist in offering the original bill as a substitute, if you please, for the House bill, but will be content to pursue the course which was adopted day before yesterday and which has already had results so gratifying to every friend of both agricultural and vocational education.

I must not be understood by this as meaning to say that there are not certain parts of the Lever bill, so called, rather objectionable to me. I think there ought to be some amendments, and we ought to make them now. I happened to be out of the Senate for a moment, and I did not dream that the amendment would be adopted so quickly and that the bill would pass from the Committee of the Whole into the Senate, or I would have suggested certain amendments. I do not believe at all in the extension of the franking privilege. That is a matter which is very easily corrected by a simple amendment. Striking out half a dozen lines in the House bill will correct that error, if it be an error, as I think it is.

Again, I agree with the Senator from Vermont that each State ought to duplicate the contribution of \$10,000 per year, as well as the additional sums that come in year after year. I think it would deepen their sense of responsibility, and it would be more in harmony with the entire structure of the House bill. But those are mere matters of detail that can be very easily corrected.

Again, there will have to be certain amendments made in the bill as it is now in the Senate. Day before yesterday section No. 10, as it appeared in the original bill offered, was stricken out upon my motion, and the language found in section 3 of the Senate bill was inserted in its stead. That makes a difference in certain phraseology throughout the whole bill, as the Senator from Vermont will assure the Senate. I think in half a dozen sections of the bill there recurs the words "rural-school fund," and after the adoption of my amendment there will be no rural-school fund. Wherever those words occur they must be stricken out and the words "secondary-school fund" must be substituted.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will allow me, the original Senate bill No. 3 is as the Senator from Iowa desires it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely.

Mr. PAGE. It says "secondary schools, or schools of secondary grade, or high schools" shall mean schools offering courses in advance of the elementary schools, and so forth.

Mr. CUMMINS. But nowhere is it called a rural school.

Mr. PAGE. Not in the original Senate bill No. 3.

Mr. CUMMINS. Inasmuch as the original section has been now restored, the original phraseology describing it must be also restored.

I rather think that the Senator from Vermont did not benefit what might be called his part of the bill by trying to weave into it the suggestions of the Senator from Georgia. They do not fit very well, in my opinion, and I would be very glad if he could take the old Senate bill, with the exception of section 7, and offer it. I have no objection to that, but I do object, in view of everything that has occurred, to changing the whole course of procedure and now attempting to eliminate the House bill by substituting for it another measure. I would have been perfectly willing to have pursued that course had not the incident occurred which did occur here day before yesterday. I shall therefore vote against the proposed substitution by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE and Mr. BRISTOW addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. PAGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand that the bill as it is now before the Senate can be amended or perfected before the substitute amendment is voted upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unquestionably.

Mr. BRISTOW. I therefore move to strike out section 3 of the bill as it is now before the Senate. It is the section that relates to the franking privilege, beginning on line 23, page 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out from the House bill section 3, which reads as follows:

That all correspondence for the furtherance of the purposes of this act issued from the agricultural colleges to their agents, or by the agents of the said extension departments thereof receiving the benefits of this act, shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States free of charge for postage, under such regulations as the Postmaster General from time to time may prescribe.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas moves to strike out the section just read. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think that section ought to be stricken from the bill. It is perfectly easy to make an allowance in their accounts to the agents in the field or to the colleges to be paid from the fund. The amount will not be large. But if you open this service to the franking privilege, you open a door to a great deal of misuse of the mails. It is almost impossible to keep the franking privilege within the proper limitations. I certainly think that a general provision like this for the franking privilege is a very mistaken one, and I hope it will be stricken from the bill before we vote upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRISTOW. I offer further to amend, on page 4, by striking out in line 7 after "part" the words "its allotment" and insert "any"; and also by striking out the word "additional" in line 8, so that it will read:

That no State shall be entitled to any part of any of these sums unless its legislature has heretofore provided, etc.

That makes the State appropriate an equal amount with the Federal Government of all the sums.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will not resist that motion, but I will state to the Senate the reason why this fixed sum was given. It was thought that some of the States, the smaller States, ought to have a fixed sum, and that is the theory upon which it was put in. So far as my own State is concerned and those I am especially interested in, they are perfectly ready to meet any sum the Government gives. I have no authority to consent to it, but I shall not oppose that amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. The reason why I proposed the amendment was that this is, of course, an aid to the States, and the aid is offered for two reasons. As I understand it, first it appropriates money from the General Treasury for that purpose, and that appropriation is used to encourage the States to appropriate their own money to carry on the work; so we not only appropriate the money that they will get the direct benefit from, but we induce the States to engage with the Government in this worthy cause by meeting the appropriation. I think it is nothing but just.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the Senator takes his seat, do I understand that this is to strike out the provision which gives \$10,000 to each State unless the State duplicates the \$10,000?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; it requires the States to duplicate the \$10,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This bill, I understand, was drawn up upon a principle somewhat like the compromise giving each State two Senators and Representatives according to population. In other words, it was a compromise between territoriality and population and wealth. So it was concluded to give \$10,000 to each State to start with, regardless of wealth or poverty or the size of the State, and then for the balance of the appropriations, for the most part it was given in proportion to wealth; that is to say, it was given upon condition that the State should duplicate the amount which the Federal Government gave.

Whether there be a State in the Union which could not duplicate the \$10,000 or not I do not know. Nor does that interfere with the general principle at stake. If there be such a State, it ought not to be left out entirely. If there be not such a State, then all the States stand equally as regards the \$10,000. It does not seem to me that that provision ought to be stricken out. It might very well happen that a perfectly new State might be bound up with the expenses of its new birth and everything else and be embarrassed about money.

The Senator from Kansas has said that the object of this was to aid the States in doing certain work for the people. The primary object, I take it, is to aid the people, and to leave



the people without aid because the State could not help them does not seem to me to be right.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "of its allotment," and, in line 9, strike out the word "additional," so that if amended the proviso will read:

*Provided further, That no State shall be entitled to any part of these sums unless its legislature has heretofore provided or until it shall provide, etc.*

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Kansas an additional reason that I recall now which was given for this appropriation to each State. It was that it guaranteed the immediate beginning of work everywhere without reference to appropriations, to give to each one of the States a demonstration of its value, and it would thereby lead the States to make the appropriations to call for the additional sums. I rather think that it is a desirable part of the bill.

Mr. BRISTOW. It seems to me that when the Federal Government proposes to aid the States in their educational development, this is going a good ways from our old idea. We are appropriating money for educational purposes to the various States, and it appears to me it is certainly good policy to require the various States to make an appropriation to meet that.

The objection has been made to meet that that this will fall more heavily upon the small States than the large States, a State of half a million of population as compared with a State of 5,000,000 population. But \$10,000 for the educational benefit of a half million people is a great deal larger proportionate contribution to the educational facilities of that State than if the State had 5,000,000 people.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will permit me an interruption, I think he is in error there. Territoriality has something to do with it. You may give a State, if it is a large State, with a sparse population, a certain sum of money to be expended for a certain purpose and it will not benefit it near so much as it would benefit a State of the same population with one-tenth of that area.

That reminds me of another defect in this bill. It says, for example, that there shall not be above one agricultural high school for five counties. Of course that is easy in the thickly settled Northeast, but without going down to Texas or Arizona, stopping at Mississippi on the way, five counties in my State, of which my own county would be a center, and Washington and Holmes and Hinds and Warren, the surrounding counties, would about duplicate the area of the State of Connecticut. So you have a high school there, with the people to attend it about five times as far, do you not understand? So they must go and board in order to get the same benefit that would be gotten in Rhode Island from taking the family buggy and driving in every day.

I am merely using that as an illustration just at present; but the assumption that just because a thing is a territorial area and called a State, it could get the same benefit from \$10,000 which a smaller and more compact area could get with many more children enjoying the privilege, is a mistake.

Mr. BRISTOW. It seems to me that, if the Federal Government is going to appropriate money for the educational facilities of the State, it is nothing but fair that the State should be required to meet that appropriation by an equal amount of its own funds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me ask the Senator one more question, and then I shall not disturb him further: Is the purpose of the bill to help the States or to help the people?

Mr. BRISTOW. It is to help both—to help the people and to help the States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I take it that the object and the purpose of the bill is not to help the political entity that we call a State, but that it is to help the citizens of the United States in acquiring a vocational and agricultural education.

Mr. BRISTOW. The educational system of the country has been in charge of the States. We have not launched out until this time upon any great national educational system. There are a great many people who question the wisdom of it. Now, certainly I question the wisdom of the Government making an appropriation direct to the States for educational purposes. I may consent to an appropriation, provided the State will provide an equal amount, the purpose being to encourage the establishment of proper educational facilities in all the States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will permit me to break a promise so recently made, I will say that I agree with the Senator, of course, that the instrumentality, the trustee in a certain sense, is the State; but, after all, the beneficiaries are the children of the people in the States operating from the Federal Government through the States.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senate any further on this question. I wish the Senate, if they are so inclined, to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute Senate bill No. 3—

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

Mr. PAGE. I beg pardon; I thought the Senator from Kansas had yielded the floor.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I ask that the question be put on my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let us have the yeas and nays on that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WETMORE (when Mr. LIPPITT's name was called). My colleague [Mr. LIPPITT] has a general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA].

Mr. RICHARDSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I wish to transfer the general pair which I have with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVERS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OLIVER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I wish to transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] to my colleague [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (after having voted in the affirmative). The occupant of the chair is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. As that Senator has not voted, the vote is withdrawn.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] did not vote. I have a pair with that Senator, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 18, as follows:

#### YEAS—40.

Bourne	Cummins	Kern	Perkins
Bradley	Dillingham	La Follette	Pointexter
Brandegge	Dixon	Lodge	Pomerene
Bristow	Gamble	McCumber	Root
Brown	Gronna	McLean	Sanders
Burnham	Guggenheim	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Catron	Hitchcock	Myers	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Nelson	Townsend
Crawford	Jones	Page	Wetmore
Cullom	Kanyon	Percy	Works

#### NAYS—18.

Bankhead	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	Swanson
Bryan	Johnston, Tex.	Perky	Thornton
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Williams
Fletcher	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	
Heiskell	Owen	Smith, Ga.	

#### NOT VOTING—37.

Ashurst	Curtis	Massey	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	du Pont	Newlands	Stephenson
Borah	Fall	O'Gorman	Stene
Briggs	Foster	Oliver	Sutherland
Burton	Gallinger	Penrose	Tillman
Chamberlain	Gardner	Reed	Warren
Clapp	Gore	Richardson	Watson
Clarke, Ark.	Jackson	Shively	
Crane	Lea	Smith, Md.	
Culberson	Lippitt	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. BRISTOW's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. I offer a series of amendments which are purely formal. The Senate has adopted section 3 of the Senate

bill as now section 10 of the bill before the Senate. In that section the words used are "secondary schools" and not "rural schools." I therefore move to strike out the words "rural schools," where they are found; and I ask unanimous consent that it may be done without pointing out the line of each amendment where those words occur in sections 15, 16, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, and 33, and to substitute in each instance the words "secondary schools."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Wherever the words "rural schools" appear in sections 15, 16, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, and 33, they shall be stricken out and the words "secondary schools" substituted therefor.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I rather hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa may be adopted, although I want to state here and now that there have been, I will not say a multitude of amendments, but a great many amendments made to this bill, so that the bill is almost ridiculous in its make-up, if we take it in its present form. For instance, we have changed it, I think, by adding after the word "States" the words "and Territories." The bill from first to last has been drawn with particular reference to States, and I do not believe it will articulate with the Territorial laws. It is true that you have amended the Lever bill, so called, in two very important particulars to-day; you have, by a very decided vote, stricken out that feature which gave the States \$10,000 each without the States paying another \$10,000, and you have stricken out the feature giving them the franking privilege.

Now, I want to terminate this debate, so far as I am concerned, by saying that it is not exceedingly material whether you do or do not adopt the amendment which I am about to offer. I am simply going to add that I believe that if we take the Page bill in its entirety, we shall have a perfected bill, while, if we take the bill which we have amended so hastily, we shall get a bill that is full of incongruities.

In closing let me simply add that I hope the friends of Senate bill 3 will feel that, all things considered, it is wise to adopt the amendment which I have suggested, but there will be no broken hearts if this is not done. I believe it should be done, because I think Senate bill 3 is the better bill, but whatever the vote of the Senate may be I shall be satisfied.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to say that at the last session the Page bill was presented to me. I examined it quite thoroughly, and was convinced of the wisdom and the propriety of the measure. After that I received very many letters—nearly 200, as I recall—from a great many educational institutions in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania urging its passage. I pledged myself to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] that I would stand by him. I voted for the proposition that was suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]; but since it has been deemed best and wisest upon the part of the Senator from Vermont to urge the passage of his bill, in this controversy I will square myself with my agreement though the heavens fall. I am going to stand by the bill of the Senator from Vermont.

I want to vote for some measure that will tend to dignify labor. The whole trend of the times has been in contradiction to the man or the woman who works with his or her hands. Every effort has been made to hold up to the average young man the idea of being a lawyer, a doctor, or a theologian; the idea has been instilled into him that a profession should be his chief ambition in life. I want to do what little I can to dignify labor and induce men to labor. It is all very well in the clamor of the day to urge the youth of the land to stay on the farm; but the disposition of the country has been to ignore the farm boy, to frown on him with sneers and sundry little innuendoes aggravating to the sensitive mind. This has driven myriads of boys from the farm. I shall vote with the greatest pleasure and the greatest relish for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have listened to this discussion and have been considering at different times the bill in charge of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] for a great many months, and I think I am somewhat familiar with it. As I understand, the only objection to passing the substitute is the parliamentary situation, and possibly some agreement which seems to have been rather unilateral, the minds of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] never having met in a common understanding

in regard to it. Aside from that, no one questions that the so-called Page bill contains all the features of the Lever bill. I have heard nobody dispute that proposition.

Senators say that possibly the measure will have a different standing before the other House if we pass the House bill as it has been amended instead of the Page bill. I am somewhat familiar with the procedure in the House, and I can not understand that there are any more difficulties attaching to the proposed substitute than will attend the bill as we have already amended it. It has been amended and will go to conference or to a committee of the other House. It will have to go to a committee according to the argument of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], because it materially changes the House bill. This does not necessarily follow and probably it will not.

So far as I am concerned, if I were to consider the parliamentary situation and were to be governed entirely by the effect either upon the other House or upon this, the question would be decided in my mind by the fact that the Senator from Vermont has had charge of this bill and has pressed it in season and out for many months, yielding too frequently, as it seems to me, to the requests of Senators, in order that they might place something in its stead. Further, if I understand aright, up until the day before yesterday this bill has been as much discussed as has the Lever bill and is better understood in the Senate. So it occurs to me that we can accomplish all that all Senators want, so far as legislation is concerned, if the House bill be amended by substituting after the enacting clause the Page bill, which, I repeat, contains everything that is in the Lever bill and is drawn with greater care. Its author has deliberated upon it for months; it has profited by the work of experts and is clear and harmonious in its terms. On the other hand, I venture to state that few Senators understand just what has been done by the Senate to the House bill. We know it has been changed day after day, here a little and there a little, but I feel sure that no one knows exactly what the bill is or whether it has been properly constructed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will permit me, why does he think so? It never was submitted to a committee; it has never been before the Agricultural Committee at all; and it has never been scrutinized line by line or section by section by the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Which bill has not?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Page bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Page bill has been presented to the Senate from the Committee on Agriculture and was discussed by the Senator from Vermont for several days, as I remember. It has been generally understood and discussed throughout the country. I have known few bills that have seemed to excite more interest and more attention than has the Page bill. The people understand it; and I confess, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I understand it much better than I do the Lever bill as it has been amended up to this moment. I quite agree with the Senator from Vermont that if we pass the Lever bill to-day possibly we may pass something that we do not understand. Few Senators know just what we have done and the parts of the bill may be inharmonious. I desire to ask the Senator from Vermont a question which has been suggested to me by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. Was his bill before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate?

Mr. PAGE. Of course, we have discussed this matter a long time in the Senate, and I supposed that every feature had been before the committee. It may be, however, that there have been some amendments made in the Senate which were never considered by the committee; but the bill has been before the committee and has been considered in all its essential features.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understand, then, that Senate bill No. 3 has been considered by the committee?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; and it has been reported.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not like to yield until I get an answer from the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE. It has been reported.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Then, it went to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, did it not?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And was reported by that committee?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the Senator allow me a word there?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I should like to have that question answered.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was a member of the subcommittee which considered the Page bill. We had hearings on the substance of this bill, not in the technical form in which it is here now, but the entire scope of this bill, the agricultural features



and the vocational educational features of it, were considered. Representatives from the leading colleges of the United States, both agricultural colleges and universities, came to Washington on two different occasions, and I remember that we had hearings which extended over several days and that a report was submitted by the Senator from Vermont to the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—a most exhaustive report upon the different features of this bill, the committee having given him authority to collect the information. This proposed legislation is the result of all that. I doubt if during the last two years there has come before the Senate a bill that was the subject of more extensive preliminary investigation and work and the subject of a larger correspondence with educational leaders of this country than the Page bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Now, let me ask the Senator from Vermont directly, Is it not true that Senate bill No. 3 was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and through the Senator from Vermont reported to the Senate?

Mr. PAGE. It was.

Mr. BURNHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PAGE. In just a moment.

Mr. BURNHAM. I merely want to corroborate the statement of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. That is all I care to say.

Mr. PAGE. The bill was reported to the Senate, but subsequently was redrafted in some minor particulars. I asked unanimous consent of the Senate that the redrafted bill might be substituted in place of the bill originally reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that unanimous consent was given.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I have both the bills here. The one which was passed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is 16 pages long, while the bill subsequently presented and now being considered is 28 pages long; so that the second bill can not be exactly the same measure.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I hold in my hand Senate bill No. 3, Calendar No. 348, upon which I find the following notation:

In the Senate of the United States.

April 6, 1911. Mr. PAGE introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. February 26, 1912. Reported by Mr. PAGE, with amendments.

June 14, 1912. By unanimous consent the text of original bill and reported amendments withdrawn, and substitute reported, placed on calendar, and printed in roman.

July 24, 1912. Ordered reprinted as agreed to in Committee of the Whole; all in roman.

That is the record of the bill as it appears here on the desks of Senators.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to propound an inquiry to the Senator from Georgia? I did not understand his reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. Do I understand, then, that the bill now offered as an amendment, consisting of 28 pages, has never been considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Unquestionably it has never been before the Agricultural Committee at all.

Mr. SWANSON. Not before a committee of the Senate for consideration at all?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The first Senate bill, No. 3, 16 pages long, was passed on and reported by the Agricultural Committee. After that was submitted to the Senate the Senator from Vermont redrafted his bill, and the bill now presented, 28 pages long, has never been before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is the Senator—

Mr. SWANSON. And my inquiry—

Mr. TOWNSEND. Just a moment. Is the Senator from Georgia on the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Then I take it the Senator from Georgia gave his consent that the original bill and reported amendments should be withdrawn and the substitute, as presented by the Senator from Vermont, should stand in place of the bill as reported by him.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My statement was that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had not examined and passed upon that bill. My consent was no more than the consent of each other Senator. The Senator from Vermont had

charge of the matter. He referred to it as his bill, and it was his bill, and when he asked to present a substitute we all consented. The Senator from Michigan consented just as I did; but the bill did not go back to the Committee on Agriculture. It was the Committee of the Whole Senate that consented to the substitution.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not complaining about it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My only point was that the bill of 28 pages has never been considered in detail by the Senate and has never been considered in detail by the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. Right there let me ask the Senator from Georgia a question, with the consent of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. My question is as to whether or not the extra pages are not made up of the Lever bill, which is now attached to the Page bill?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Not at all; no. The portion of the bill which is similar to the Lever bill is exactly the same in the first bill of 16 pages and in the second bill of 28 pages. There are a number of quite substantial changes in the two bills. The new bill, which was presented with the 28 pages in it, has quite a number of features different from the old bill of 16 pages which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry approved.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think two things are undisputed at the present time, namely, that the pending bill, the Lever bill as it has been amended, contains the provisions of the Lever bill and also practically all that was contained in the Page bill. On the other hand, the Page amendment contains practically everything that was in the Page bill, and also all of the principal provisions of the Lever bill. Whichever way we vote, we are practically passing the same bill, whether we adopt the Page amendment to the Lever bill, or amend the Lever bill by inserting the Page bill as a substitute.

My vote is going to be governed by this consideration: The Senator from Vermont has had this bill before the Senate for at least two years. He has devoted a great deal of study to it. Instead of having a proposition now which comes in the shape of divers amendments attached in different ways, he has the same proposition drawn up logically, properly, and in its order; and it is known as the Page bill. So that practically it is a question whether we will adopt the bill that has the name of a Member of the House attached to it, or the name of the Senator from Vermont. That is practically all there is to it now. Considering the length of time we have had the Page bill before us, I stand ready to give my colleague the compliment of voting that his bill shall be passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation as the Chair understands it.

Sundry amendments have been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole. The question is, the bill having been reported to the Senate, whether or not the Senate shall concur in those amendments. The Senator from Vermont proposes before that action is taken to strike out and insert. The Chair thinks that can not be done, but that the question should first be put upon concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, for the reason that any Senator can ask for a separate vote upon any amendment agreed to. So that, whether or not the amendments agreed to as in Committee of the Whole are concurred in in the Senate, the Senator from Vermont can then offer his substitute.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, can the Senator from Vermont offer a substitute after the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole have been concurred in in the Senate? I venture to suggest that the point at which he must offer his substitute is before we pass in the Senate on the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole. That is, he must offer it as a substitute for the original bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Why can not the Senator from Vermont offer his substitute for the original bill after the original bill has been perfected by the amendments which the Senate has adopted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that that can be done.

Mr. LODGE. It can be done in that way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendments agreed to as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LODGE. It occurred to me that under our usual practice, after amendments made as in Committee of the Whole had been concurred in in the Senate, it would be impossible then for the Senate to vote out those amendments, because they would have been adopted both as in Committee of the Whole and in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks a motion to strike out the entire bill and insert would be in order.

The question now is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I now move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the amendment which was offered by me on the 17th of January, which is identical with Senate bill No. 3, reported to the Senate June 14, 1912. It is what is known as the Page bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the amendment, and read to the end of section 5, on page 5.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if it is in order, I move to dispense with the further reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can ask unanimous consent that the further reading be dispensed with.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the question?

Mr. LODGE. The question is on substituting the Page bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. The vote is being taken on the question of substituting the Page bill?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GARDNER (when his name was called). Notwithstanding my pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE] on the pending measure, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. RICHARDSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and I withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I wish to transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULBERSON (after having voted in the negative). I will ask if the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that that Senator has not voted.

Mr. CULBERSON. I transfer my general pair with that Senator to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] and will allow my vote to stand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], and for that reason withholds his vote.

Mr. PERKINS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMOOT. I was requested to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER] is paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]; that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]; and that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. WATSON] is paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS].

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 30, as follows:

#### YEAS—31.

Bradley	Dillingham	Lodge	Poindexter
Brandegree	Gamble	McCumber	Sanders
Brown	Gardner	McLean	Smoot
Catron	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Stephenson
Chilton	Guggenheim	Nelson	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Wetmore
Crawford	Jones	Page	Works
Cullom	Kenyon	Perkins	

#### NAYS—30.

Ashurst	Cummins	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Fletcher	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bourne	Heiskell	Newlands	Swanson
Bristow	Hitchcock	Paynter	Thomas
Bryan	Johnston, Ala.	Percy	Thornton
Burnham	Johnston, Tex.	Perky	Williams
Burton	Kern	Pomerene	
Culberson	La Follette	Simmons	

#### NOT VOTING—34.

Bacon	du Pont	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Fall	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Briggs	Foster	Owen	Stone
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Sutherland
Clapp	Gore	Reed	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Jackson	Richardson	Warren
Crane	Lea	Root	Watson
Curtis	Lippitt	Shively	
Dixon	Massey	Smith, Md.	

So Mr. PAGE's amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 30, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 29, 1913.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our heavenly Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, we realize that we are involved in a moral order which Thou hast ordained; that we can do nothing without Thee; yet we may set ourselves against that order and bring harm to ourselves and others; hence we pray for wisdom to guide us, strength to sustain us in a willingness to work with Thee, that we may hasten the coming of Thy kingdom upon the earth. And Glory and honor and praise be Thine forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as this is Calendar Wednesday, I desire to ask unanimous consent that I may move to elect three or four gentlemen to fill vacancies on committees.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to nominate certain gentlemen to fill vacancies on committees.

Mr. MANN. I assume that this will take no time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. None at all. There is no contest about it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, for the Committee on Ways and Means, I wish to make the following nominations to fill existing committee vacancies:

Hon. JOHN H. ROTHERMEL to the vacancy on the Appropriations Committee occasioned by the death of Hon. J. G. McHenry.

Hon. GEORGE WHITE to the vacancy on the Appropriations Committee occasioned by the resignation of Hon. James Cox.

Hon. SCOTT FERRIS to the chairmanship of the Public Lands Committee occasioned by the resignation of Hon. Joseph T. Robinson.

Hon. C. B. SMITH to the vacancy on the Foreign Affairs Committee occasioned by the resignation of Hon. William Sulzer.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? If not, the question is on the election of those nominated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The question was taken, and the above-named Members were elected.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 28499) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second times, and with the accompanying report (No. 1413), ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.



Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that I will call this bill up immediately after the passage of the fortifications bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the presentation of the bill, but I wish to reserve all points of order upon the bill.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 39.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return the bill (S. 7162) to amend section 801 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.*

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 24194. An act to create a new division of the western judicial district of Texas, and to provide for terms of court at Pecos, Tex., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 18841. An act incorporating the National Institute of Arts and Letters.

#### TIME OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the call rests on the Committee on the Library.

#### LINCOLN MEMORIAL.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on the Library to call up Senate joint resolution 158.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) approving the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln memorial.

*Resolved, etc., That the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln memorial, determined upon and recommended to Congress December 4, 1912, by the commission created by the act entitled "An act to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln," approved February 9, 1911, be, and the same are hereby, approved.*

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, we have come to an agreement, if it is agreeable to the other Members of the House, with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], representing the Gettysburg proposition, that we may debate this subject for two hours on each side, and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered on Senate joint resolution No. 158.

Mr. BORLAND. I take it that the gentleman is asking unanimous consent to the statement he is making now?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BORLAND. If the previous question is ordered at the end of the agreed debate of two hours, will it be permissible to offer an amendment after ordering the previous question?

The SPEAKER. It will not, after ordering the previous question.

Mr. BORLAND. The agreement we have made extends to two hours' general debate on each side—four hours in all—but I have no power or disposition to preclude the right of any Member to offer amendments. I intend to offer an amendment of my own during the two hours' general debate, and I believe the agreement might well be that the amendments may be offered after the general debate or after the previous question, but voted on without further debate. I do not desire to extend the debate beyond the four hours.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] desires to offer an amendment. I can not consent to an agreement that everybody in the House should offer an amendment, because it might take a week to dispose of them. I am perfectly willing to consent to an agreement that two hours' general debate should be had on a side, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] shall have the right to offer an amendment, and that at the end of four hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendment to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it is only fair to say to the House that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] notified the Chair before the House met that he wants to offer an amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have an amendment that I desire to offer at the proper time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN. And also that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LAFEAN] shall have the right to offer an amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. And that these amendments may be offered after my amendment is disposed of.

Mr. MANN. Will be offered at any time and be pending.

The SPEAKER. Is the proposition to cut everybody off from offering amendments except the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LAFEAN]?

Mr. EVANS. That is the proposition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JAMES. Well, Mr. Speaker, all these amendments that are offered to this resolution ought to be offered and pending before any one particular amendment is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. That will have to be done. They have not yet agreed upon that.

Mr. JAMES. I think the request of the gentleman from Missouri was—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will try to state what the sum total of these requests is: That the general debate on this proposition shall extend for four hours—that is, if enough gentlemen want to speak to occupy four hours—one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], and at the end of the four hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered. In the meantime the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LAFEAN] shall have the privilege of offering amendments, and their amendments shall all be pending when the previous question is ordered.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What time will be given to each one of us to present our amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know about that. The Chair will recognize these three gentlemen to offer their amendments.

Mr. MANN. To offer their amendments.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. BOOHER. I rise to ask, if this agreement goes through, does it cut out everybody else from offering an amendment?

The SPEAKER. It undoubtedly does.

Mr. BOOHER. Does it take unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. BOOHER. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] objects.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps a better solution of the matter would be that general debate go on for four hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] and two hours to be controlled by myself, and that at the end of that the previous question shall be considered as ordered, but that amendments may be offered before or after the previous question and voted on without debate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] will readily see that if that agreement is entered into there might be 50 amendments offered to this resolution on which the yeas and nays might be demanded.

Mr. BORLAND. Is not that the right of the House, anyway?

Mr. MANN. It is the right of the House to prevent any amendment being offered under the operation of the previous question, if the House chooses to.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be concluded in four hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], and—

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be concluded in four hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. If no agreement is entered into, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] under the rules shall have an hour, and at any time during that hour, either in the beginning of it or at the end of it or between the beginning and end, he can move the previous question. If the previous question is voted, it shuts out everybody else from debate or amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. BORLAND. It is not desirable to do that. I do not think the House desires to do that.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] withdraw his demand for the regular order?

Mr. GARRETT. I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, for the time being.

The SPEAKER. Is anyone preferring that request?

Mr. BORLAND. I am preferring a request, as tendered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], that general debate be concluded in four hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] and two hours to be controlled by myself; but I want the unanimous consent to extend no further than that.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I can not consent to that unless there is added to it a proposition that at the end of four hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, it might be possible that the original proposition, to which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] objected, might be agreed to if it included his right to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman ask that?

Mr. JAMES. I ask that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] asks unanimous consent that general debate upon this question shall run for four hours, if enough Members desire to speak to consume four hours, and that in the meantime, at any time the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LAFEAN], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] shall have the right to offer amendments, which shall be pending, and that at the end of four hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not think it is a good precedent to set in this House, in the first place, to limit the number of amendments that may be actually offered. Again, I do not think it is a good precedent to set here to specify those who shall offer these amendments. How do the gentlemen in charge of the matter know who wishes to offer amendments until the matter is actually up? I think if we are going to specify those who are to offer amendments, the proper thing to do is for the gentleman who is in charge of the bill, Mr. EVANS, through the Speaker, to ascertain if any gentleman other than those specified wish to offer amendments, and if so, to give them an opportunity to do so.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not.

Mr. JAMES. Of course, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] will be too busy to go around and take a poll of the membership to find out who wants to offer an amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky is too well versed in the affairs of this House not to know that that is not necessary. The Speaker could ascertain by asking if there are other gentlemen who wish to offer amendments.

Mr. JAMES. I am perfectly willing that the Speaker shall do that.

Mr. EDWARDS. I will be very glad to have that done.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that the difficulty with that would be that the amendment may not suggest itself to the Member until debate has developed it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I also had that in mind.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, there are some others who are not in favor of the proposition of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] or of the other proposition, but who are in favor of one of these amendments. I want to know if there is any way whereby we can express an opinion in regard to the matter, not being in favor of either of the two propositions?

The SPEAKER. If this unanimous-consent agreement be made, then the only way the gentleman could express his opinion would be to get time either from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] or from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask if those gentlemen will give time to me in order that I may present the amendment that I propose to offer?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] propounds an inquiry to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], to know if either one of them, or both, will yield time to him or anybody else who desires to discuss these amendments?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Library, I desire to say that we do not want to shut out any

amendment to any proposition that is offered here in good faith, but we do not want any filibuster, and we want a vote on this proposition to-day.

The SPEAKER. That does not answer the question of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have already offered a resolution.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to suggest to the gentleman from Texas that if this unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] would have only two hours and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] would have two hours at their disposal.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then they could yield such time as they see proper to me for the purpose of explaining the proposition that I desire to offer, and also to other gentlemen to explain theirs.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, there are a good many gentlemen who desire to deliver speeches here to-day.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BORLAND. If this unanimous-consent agreement is not adopted, I understand the procedure will be that the gentleman from Illinois, who has called up the resolution, would be entitled to one hour in his own right, during any time of which he may move the previous question. In order to secure further debate, it would be necessary to vote down that previous question, and then anybody else who arose would secure another hour.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. BORLAND. And then if an amendment were proposed, anybody would secure an hour for or against an amendment as long as the previous question be voted down.

The SPEAKER. That is a parliamentary situation.

Mr. BORLAND. Then, Mr. Speaker, I think we can expedite this matter by the committee allowing these gentleman freedom of amendment if we limit the general debate to four hours. My purpose was that debate be limited to four hours and that amendments be offered either before or after the previous question and voted on without further debate, and I believe that the committee will see that that will be the best solution of the question.

Mr. EVANS. That is provided, however, that the previous question be considered as ordered, and then we can vote on your amendment—

Mr. BORLAND. The agreement is that the amendments be offered before or after the previous question is voted on without debate.

Mr. EVANS. Provided there is a proper limitation on the number of amendments.

Mr. BORLAND. But the gentleman will see the objection to a limitation upon the number of amendments. Some gentleman might move the previous question, or the time for the previous question might arrive before some gentleman might have had an opportunity to gain the floor to offer his amendment.

Mr. EVANS. That will be your fault.

Mr. BORLAND. No; it will not be my fault at all any more than your fault.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may want to offer an amendment here, and I do not want to be barred out. I do not want to claim for others what I would not claim for myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I wish the Chair would state again the proposition.

The SPEAKER. The proposition is that general debate on this question shall run for four hours, provided enough gentlemen want to speak to use four hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and the other half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS]; at the end of the four hours' debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered, and in the meantime the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LAFEAN], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] shall have the right to offer amendments, and they shall be considered as pending.

Mr. GRAY. What about an amendment from the gentleman from Indiana? Have I the right to offer an amendment?

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from Indiana is not included in the pool.

Mr. GRAY. Well, I object.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then I shall be forced to object, unless I have time to present my amendment.

Mr. GRAY. I object to anything I am not in.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Indiana be included in the request.



The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] asks that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] be included in this privilege to offer an amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to include the gentleman from Indiana in the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object unless I have time to present our amendment in 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] says he will object.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I should like to have at least 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems perfectly apparent the more the matter is discussed the further and further away from an agreement the House gets. There ought to be an end to it some time. I do not wish to interfere with the arrangement which the gentlemen have agreed upon, and it will be perfectly satisfactory to me if we could get it through, but it is evident we can not get it through, and therefore I demand the regular order.

Mr. JAMES. I think, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is the only one standing between the House and an agreement.

Mr. GARRETT. Very well, Mr. Speaker, I withhold the demand until we hear what can be agreed upon.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think that the House generally would like to reach a final vote on this measure to-day. [Applause.] We are getting too near the end of the session. Important supply bills are pressing for attention, and I think that the proposition submitted by Mr. EVANS on one side and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] on the other, of a four hours' debate, is reasonable, considering the general demand for an opportunity to say something on this measure, but I do believe that the agreement ought to carry with it the condition that there should be a final vote within a reasonable time after that on the resolution and any amendments that may be offered.

The SPEAKER. There will be a final vote immediately; a vote on these amendments, and then a vote on the main question, but in the meantime the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] serves notice that he will object unless Mr. EVANS and Mr. BORLAND, or either of them, yields him 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I did not hear that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think out of four hours we are entitled to at least 10 minutes.

Mr. EVANS. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas half of that time, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. BORLAND will yield the other half.

Mr. BORLAND. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. EVANS. I said I would yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from Missouri say?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Texas five minutes under that agreement.

Mr. BOOHER. I desire to make a suggestion to the gentlemen who are managing this thing apparently, that the debate be limited to five hours; that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] control two hours, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] control two, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] control one. That will let us take the vote at 6 o'clock. Those who are opposed to these two propositions ought to have more time than 10 minutes, and unless there is something of that kind I will object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

Mr. JAMES. I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] only wanted 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. What is the proposition?

The SPEAKER. The proposition as modified is this: That general debate shall run for four hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and two hours by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], each one of them agreeing to yield out of that time five minutes apiece to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS], and that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LAFEAN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] shall have the privilege of offering amendments, and that at the end of the four hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments to final passage. Is there objection?

Mr. BOOHER. I object.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) approving the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln Memorial.

*Resolved, etc.,* That the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln Memorial, determined upon and recommended to Congress December 4, 1912, by the commission created by the act entitled "An act to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln," approved February 9, 1911, be, and the same are hereby, approved.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL]. [Applause.]

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Speaker, the chief question pending before the House is whether Abraham Lincoln shall have a memorial in the city of Washington. There is no other city in the world, however large it may be, that has so many statues and monuments in its streets and public squares as has this city. There is the towering obelisk to Washington, unique in its impressiveness among all the memorials of the world. Then we have statues to generals, big and little, mounted upon horses of every breed, that give to some portions of the city the appearance of a cavalry parade. We have monuments to the foreign soldiers who aided us in establishing the independence of this country, and we have monuments and memorials to sailors of every period of our history. But the eye will search in vain for any memorial reared by the Nation in its Capital to the man who saved the Union, and in the saving of it gave up his life here, whose name was signed upon the title deed of freedom to 4,000,000 of slaves, and who reflected far greater fame upon the country by what he did in this city than any other of our statesmen. Congress has neglected its duty in this respect for a half century, and it is a reproach upon it. Lincoln does not need this monument. His place will be secure in the hearts of his countrymen for all time, and the homage of the struggling millions of mankind will go out forever to the man who illustrated the very chivalry of democracy. But the reproach will be upon us. I believe that the time has come at last when Congress can no longer fail to perform its duty to put up here in the city of Washington, the Capital of the country, a memorial to the greatest political genius our country ever produced. [Applause.]

I do not propose to be diverted into the discussion whether we should utilize the fame of Lincoln and attempt to discharge our duty to him by the construction of a national highway or by entering upon the policy of building boulevards in the different States. That is a question that should rest by itself. I think that Gettysburg was a great and dramatic battle, and that the boulevard, if one is ever to be built from here to Gettysburg, would be a very fitting thing. Before we do that we must look to the sources of our constitutional power. That question, I said, should be settled by itself. But if we are ever to have a memorial in the shape of a highway to commemorate the fame of Lincoln, then I think that highway should be built between Washington and Richmond.

Those are the two cities that but for him would have been the capitals of two independent nations. Between those cities was fought out the question whether we should have in this country one republic or two republics—whether we should have one flag or two flags. Lincoln fought for the idea of an indivisible nation, with its capital in the city of Washington. The Confederacy had its capital at Richmond. There was her president, there her cabinet, there her congress. There she kept her arms and her chariot.

That great contest was finally settled in favor of one country and one flag. If, then, we are to have a highway memorial to Abraham Lincoln, let it connect those two cities which but for him would have been the capitals of two hostile republics, and let that highway be built across the ground every inch of which was fought over by contending armies, over ground made fertile by the reddest and richest blood that was ever shed in war. [Applause.]

I take it that the House of Representatives has no disposition to-day to deny to Abraham Lincoln a memorial in the National Capital. Then the question comes, What sort of a memorial shall it be, and where shall it be placed? When I held the position now occupied by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] as chairman of the Committee on the Library, I endeavored to secure some sort of a memorial to Abraham Lincoln in the city of Washington. I endeavored to have the memorial in some way associated with the Capitol, but I found upon study that it would be so overshadowed by the Capitol that it would not be suitably placed.

The question of the site and the memorial was referred by Congress to a commission, and in the determination of the decision of that question we had the benefit of the best expert advice in the world. We had the National Commission of Fine Arts. Upon that commission was Burnham, the architect of the

World's Fair buildings at Chicago, and at the time of his death without a peer, I believe, among the architects of the world. We had that true artist, Frank Millet, whose loss perceptibly augmented even the appalling horror of the *Titanic* disaster. We had the great landscape architect, Frederick Law Olmsted, and we also had the greatest of living sculptors, Daniel French. There never was a better corps of artists, representing not one branch of art alone but representing it in its broadest aspects, than that which we had to aid us in coming to the decision that we reached.

They reported in favor of taking the site upon the banks of the Potomac, on the line of the axis running from the dome of the Capitol through the Washington Monument, and nearly a mile from the Monument. Just opposite, upon the other side, rises the home of the great Confederate chieftain, Robert E. Lee. [Applause.] Then they recommended that we adopt the plan which gentlemen—Members of the House—have seen displayed in the House lobby yonder.

Two objections have been made to that plan. The first is that it does not represent the idea of efficiency; that it is a mere waste of money to expend so much for an unproductive work. The other objection is that it is unsuitable in character to the memory of Lincoln.

I am entirely willing to rest under the scorn of gentlemen who think that we should put everything in life upon the basis of efficiency. I know there are men who would think it a mere waste of time to carve an Apollo or a Venus, when the same amount of labor might rear a hovel to shelter some human head; or who would regard the work of a painter, spending many months of his life in putting immortal tints upon canvas, as a mere waste of time, when he might devote his energies to painting many buildings and preserving them against the weather. But I have myself no sympathy with this view. I not only do not regard it as waste to encourage those pursuits which aim to cultivate and satisfy our sense of beauty, but I believe they make an appeal which makes life richer and better for all of us.

The notion of mere efficiency would cover this world of ours with concrete structures, built with the most nicely calculated strains, and would fill them up with human automatons, each devoted to his own narrow specialty, perhaps of making a boot heel, and chased by fast flying machinery all through the day. We might produce more under such system, but the individual would be shrunk, it would make of us a race of dwarfs, and our ores and coal, I believe, might better be permitted to remain in the earth's untouched bosom. I would not have our country, when the final reckoning is to be made between her and other nations, have nothing to present but an abnormally developed efficiency, and have that put beside the painting, the sculpture, the literature, the music, the architecture, and those other consummate flowers of civilization which other nations would bring. I do not underestimate a highly developed industrial system, if only there should be the more developed also those higher and more artistic expressions of the aspirations of our race, which should be the choicest possession of every one of its children.

As to the fitness of this work, it is said that you are going to erect in memory of Abraham Lincoln a Greek temple. But what would you have? Would we have an Egyptian obelisk, would we have a Turkish mosque, or a Gothic or Romanesque chapel, or would we have an American skyscraper? We must have some type, and by common consent there has been no type better fitted for this purpose than that shown in the marvelous conception of the Greek. In whatever relates to artistic expression, whether in poetry, in eloquence, in sculpture, or in architecture, who is there in the world who can surpass the Greek? What more speaking marbles were ever carved than those of Phidias? What strains of poetry have ever broken with sweeter music on the human ear than those of Homer and of Pindar? Where else has eloquence reached the chiseled beauty of Demosthenes? And although but few remnants of the architecture of the Greeks have survived the hand of the barbarian and the tooth of time, yet when we come in view of some fragments of them to-day, broken though they may be, and 20 centuries after their time, we stand before them enthralled in wonder.

There is nothing more beautiful in architecture than the column of the Greek. Would we speak scornfully of this Capitol in which we now are as a Greek temple? What building in the world is more decorated with the Greek style of architecture than this? The Greek column speaks. It illustrates dignity, beauty, simplicity, and strength. However the soul of Abraham Lincoln might have been chiseled in its shaping, as he came finally to be every one of those elements was represented in his character.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this memorial, which has been designed by the greatest artists and architects whose advice we could procure. I am in favor of it because of its site upon the banks of the Potomac. It will be upon a spot over which the eyes of Lincoln used to look longingly and yearningly toward that part of the Union which he was trying to keep as a part of our common country. It will have across the river the home of the great Confederate chieftain, which now is the cemetery of thousands of heroes who wore both the blue and the gray. It will be a memorial in keeping with the majesty and the beauty of his character. In the fitness of its location, in the nobility of its character, and in the unique fame which it shall forever commemorate generations distant will be the day when it shall be paralleled by any other memorial reared to any one of the children of men. [Applause.]

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and ask that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] now proceed.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is evidently under the impression that I have some time. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman does not want to use any more time now, I will ask for time in my own right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize any gentleman who desires to speak.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for one hour.

Mr. BORLAND. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois is unaware that an agreement has not been made.

Mr. EVANS. Oh, no; I am aware that there is no agreement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the balance of his time, which is 45 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for an hour.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a substitute which I offer for the pending resolution, which I ask to have read at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln memorial determined upon and recommended to Congress December 4, 1912, by the commission created by the act entitled "An act to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln," approved February 9, 1911, be, and the same are hereby, disapproved and the commission is hereby continued, with directions to report to Congress at the session beginning the first Monday in December, 1913, upon a memorial highway from Washington to the national battle field of Gettysburg, or any other appropriate memorial road, bridge, institution, or structure.*

Mr. MANN. Is this an amendment offered by the gentleman, or a substitute?

Mr. BORLAND. A substitute.

The SPEAKER. It seems to be an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln memorial determined upon and recommended to Congress December 4, 1912, by the commission created by the act entitled "An act to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln," approved February 9, 1911, be, and the same are hereby, disapproved and the commission is hereby continued, with directions to report to Congress at the session beginning the first Monday in December, 1913, upon a memorial highway from Washington to the national battle field of Gettysburg, or any other appropriate memorial road, bridge, institution, or structure.*

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order; or, I am perfectly willing to reserve it for a time, if the gentleman desires to address the House.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. The point of order is, first, that this is a joint resolution which the gentleman proposes to change to a concurrent resolution; second, that the amendment is not germane to the resolution pending before the House.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, the substitute was drawn at the time that the concurrent resolution was on the calendar. Then they discovered their blunder and changed it to a joint resolution, and the joint resolution has been called up. I ask that this be changed to the proper form of a joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to withdraw it, remodel it, and offer it again.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask that it be changed by substituting the words "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled," and that it be entitled a joint resolution.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will move to strike out all after the resolving clause, he will have no difficulty about that proposition.

Mr. BORLAND. I offer it as a substitute for all after the resolving clause.



The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the modification. The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following.

The SPEAKER. It is not necessary to read the body of the substitute again.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the resolution pending before the House; or I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman does not desire it disposed of at this time.

The SPEAKER. Which of the alternatives does the gentleman from Missouri prefer?

Mr. BORLAND. I will ask the gentleman to reserve his point of order. I do not think there is anything in it, but let it be reserved.

Mr. MANN. I think the point of order is perfectly good, but I am willing to reserve it and let the gentleman discuss his proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for an hour.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have here another Lincoln memorial project, handed me this morning by Col. McElroy, editor of the National Tribune, which has been approved by many citizens and citizen soldiers of Washington. This scheme has a utility feature. It provides for a Lincoln temple at the corner of Seventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, where the Government owns the ground, and for a great convention hall, where the people from the whole country coming here in religious, commercial, and other conventions, can have a free and convenient meeting place. As stated by Col. McElroy, it would be to Washington what the Forum was to Rome and the Acropolis to Athens. It would be a Greek temple with a meaning—a temple of patriotism. But in my limited time I can not discuss this project. I am for the Lincoln highway—72 miles—from Washington to Gettysburg.

Only once did I ever meet Abraham Lincoln. That was on the 4th of March, 1865, when I was clothed in the grim harness of war, with my once blue uniform tarnished with grime from the red-clay roads of northern Georgia. In November, 1864, I voted as an Ohio soldier for Abraham Lincoln for President while on the march in western Tennessee—voted in an old camp kettle, and we counted the votes at night by the light of the bivouac fires. I want to vote for a permanent and fitting and generous testimonial to Abraham Lincoln now, but not for a \$2,000,000 Greek temple, to commemorate the greatest American of his epoch, who never even learned the Greek alphabet. [Applause.]

We have hundreds of monuments dedicated to Abraham Lincoln now. We have four in this National Capital. Under the great central dome stands, in white marble, Vinnie Ream's famous statue of Abraham Lincoln in the plain clothes of an American citizen. Only a few feet to the left is another statue—head and bust—also in marble, double heroic size. In Judiciary Square, on a raised pedestal, is a full-length statue of Lincoln, also in marble. In Lincoln Park stands the historic bronze statue of Lincoln unshackling the slave. So far as I know, none of the patriotic people of the United States are demanding more multiplication of Lincoln statues in this city. The city is now full of statues and monuments that are silent and cold and stand for nothing but Grecian art and sculpture and remind us only of nations and civilizations that are dead.

I will vote for a monument or statue, with ideas in it—a statue to fittingly typify Abraham Lincoln's mission and career. But there is nothing in this Greek temple, however artistic, however ornate, however impressive, that even suggests to the critical observer either the character, or career, or mission of Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln was never a student of Greek art or Greek sculpture. A Greek temple would be an appropriate testimonial to a learned linguist of a national university who had worn out his life in teaching the literature of a dead language, or of a Pagan civilization long since dead, but never for a great citizen of this Republic, who never saw the inside of a university in his school days and who learned to read books at night by the light of a pine-knot fire. Born in a cabin, he breathed the untainted air of the woods and fields. Born poor, but rich in soul and brain and hope and courage. Can we satisfy the patriotic longings of the American people to fittingly commemorate the memory of Lincoln by erecting a \$2,000,000 Grecian temple in the National Capital? I do not believe it. We concede that no more is to be said of Abraham Lincoln than has already been written. History has said its last word. We all know that he was, of all public men of his

time, the simplest in manners, the most all-pervading in human sympathy, the most constant in his devotion to his ideals. North or South, he has no critics to-day. I met him only once. But I stood within 10 feet of Abraham Lincoln on the 4th of March, 1865, and heard him deliver his last inaugural—his last oration on earth. I heard him say:

Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan.

[Applause.]

We have made 48 years of history since that eventful day, but I can see Lincoln now as I saw him then, a tall, gaunt, stalwart man, with deep lines of care furrowing his cheeks, with inexpressible sadness in his face, a face that told the story of a man of many sorrows. A sad face, a strong face, a face radiant with the inspiration of a great soul, as he voiced in prophecy the ultimate destiny of this Nation. As a soldier of the Republic I heard Abraham Lincoln voice his national ideals in his last oration to the American people, and to-day as a citizen of a restored Republic I intend to vote for my conscientious conception of those ideals. It is time we had some American art and American sculpture and American ideas in this National Capital. The brave and prescient patriots of the Revolutionary epoch who founded this Capital and started the young Republic on its career never intended to make this city the home of wealth and monumental splendor, like Athens or Rome. It was intentionally located in the wilderness, that the representatives of the people should be free from the venal influences, the demoralizing environment of a dominating social set of money-fat idlers. [Applause.] This is the only great Capital around the world originally planned in native forest. All the great capitals of the Old World had long commercial lives before being crowned as capitals. It was only 48 days after the last act of ratification of the Federal Constitution that the first-born Congress of the original thirteen States decreed the wilderness on the eastern shore of the Potomac as the future Capital of the Republic.

Only a short time ago I was much amused over the observations of a newly married pair from Fort Wayne, Ind., who came here to shed their honeymoon. They were gazing in awe and admiration at the semicolossal group of statuary on the east front of the Capitol by Persico, erected in 1846, representing the discovery of America. Columbus is personated holding at arm's length a small globe on the top of which is cut "America." Beneath his ponderous legs crouches an awe-stricken Indian girl without a particle of drapery to shield her shapeliness from the gaze of mankind. It took five years to make the group and cost us \$24,000. The ridiculous phase of this historic group was very pertinently illustrated by the observations of our young couple from Fort Wayne. I was not surprised when the young lady remarked, "I reckon that is Pocahontas and Capt. John Smith." "No; Flo," remarked the young man, "that is not a captain's uniform and Pocahontas never appeared in that shape without something on. This chap has on tight pants you see and baseball sandals, and what's that he's got in his hands? That is probably a baseball. I tell you what I think this is, Flo, you know Washington has got a baseball team called the Senators, and I'll bet yer this represents the pitcher, as the champion of America, bossing the Goddess of Liberty, and that stone woman on the Dome is the Goddess." [Laughter.]

The young lady smiled sweetly on the young man, in evident pride that he was so well up in the classics, and they walked over to view the other group just opposite. This group is intended to represent the sentiment of America. It is by Greenough and was executed in 1842 and cost \$24,000. There are five figures—a hunter rescuing a naked white woman, with a naked baby, from a naked savage, while by the side of the woman is the faithful dog, appearing as if he did not know what all the racket is about. "What do you say that is, Charlie?" said our sweet nineteen. Charlie gazed intently at the naked Indian, the nude woman, the undraped baby, and the indifferent dog, and then slowly said, "Flo, I just give that up." Flo and Charlie are no exceptions to the great run of tourists. Thousands of visitors and curiosity hunters gaze daily upon these ridiculous groups of allegorical statuary, and no one appears to comprehend their significance.

A NAKED GEORGE WASHINGTON.

One of the most hideous pieces of art that mortal man ever beheld is the colossal statue of George Washington, by Greenough, ordered by Congress in 1832 for the Rotunda of the Capitol. It was made in Florence, Italy; was eight years in construction; is 12 feet high; weighs 12 tons; and cost \$44,000. In 1840 the U. S. frigate *Constitution* was dispatched to Florence, Italy, to bring this monstrous monstrosity to the United States.



It was landed here in 1841, found to be too large for the Rotunda, and it stood in front of the Capitol for over half a century. It is now hidden from all human eyes, and I trust forever.

This immense figure represents George Washington naked to the waist, sitting in a chair. The right hand is raised high above the head and points to heaven; the left hand holds a Roman short sword, with the handle presented. A mantle falls over the legs. There is a small figure of Columbus on the left side and of an Indian on the other. There is a Latin motto carved on the back of the chair and on the front of the pedestal in raised letters. We might excuse a sculptor who would set up for public admiration the nude figure of a gladiator or a prize fighter, but was it not a hideous thing to put up a naked George Washington in front of our National Capitol? Without going further into the observations of rural tourists, is it not an outrage on American art to have a statue of George Washington naked, sitting in the chair of a Roman emperor, holding the sword of a Roman soldier, encompassed about with Roman symbols, and disfigured with a Latin motto? And yet this statue is a classic, patterned to commemorate Pagan art and sculpture, the same as the proposed Greek temple.

Go down Capitol Hill and look at the unsightly monstrosity—that marble memorial to Gen. Grant. We have just wasted a quarter of a million on that statue. Take a view of the pedestal in the center, surrounded by four African lions, crouching with desperate claws. At one end of this misfit in marble is a group in bronze, intended to represent four plunging, crouching, rearing artillery horses, pulling a 6-pounder cannon over an impossible road of stumps and mud, with the two leading horses, with forelegs high in air, over a precipice. A cruel, painful conception, and entirely inappropriate, as Gen. Grant never commanded a battery in war and never shot a cannon. And the African lions—not even a product of America. Not an idea in it to remind us of Gen. Grant; not a suggestion of the remarkable career, both in war and peace, of the foremost man of all the world.

Look at the equestrian statue of Gen. Jackson in front of the White House. See the hero of New Orleans on an impossible war horse, a classic from Rome, if you please, patterned after the show riders of the Roman amphitheater, with their horses on their hind legs in the sawdust. Not thus sat Gen. Jackson in war's reeling fray, when the foam hung from the lips of his tired horse and his wet limbs were slashed with the bloody slime of the battle field.

Look at the great figure above the central dome of this Capitol, that probably 90,000,000 of people think is the Goddess of Liberty. This is also an Italian product—a Roman classic, if you please. It was designed by Crawford in Rome in 1858. It is the figure of a woman, the sword and shield of a soldier, and the Phrygian helmet of a Pagan. This helmet is pierced by a crest of eagle quills. The only thing American about this statue is the eagle quills. Hence we have no Goddess of Liberty on the dome to personate a country all free and forever to be free. Let us chisel off the barbarous Pagan helmet and place a liberty cap instead, with a tiara of 48 stars, and bespangle it with jeweled gems from our mountains and mines—something American, something to symbolize a great Republic. [Applause.]

Take the Washington Monument, conceived and planned and originally built to the height of 152 feet by the contributions of patriotic citizens and societies. And how does that immense pile of white marble compare with Mount Vernon as a national shrine. Not at all. There is no sentiment, no patriotic inspiration in the cold conceits of sculptured marble. The hundreds of thousands of visitors and excursionists to this National Capitol take a far-away look at this cold marble pile and then go to Mount Vernon. And in the environment of the home of George Washington, in the association of George Washington with his historic mansion, and in the presence of his tomb Mount Vernon and not the Washington Monument has become our national shrine. And it will so remain long after the Washington Monument has crumbled into dust.

The most heroic incident in the life of Abraham Lincoln was his oration on the battle field of Gettysburg. It is conceded to be the leading classic in the heroic literature of the war period. The most valued and heroic incident in the life of Abraham Lincoln was his oration on this great battle field. Here was fought the most desperate, the most signal, and the most decisive battle of the entire four years' war. Next July the last sad remnants of two great armies—the blue and the gray—will meet in reunion on the battle field of Gettysburg—a continent-wide patriotic reunion to proclaim to all the world that this Nation is now one and inseparable. Let the Congress of the United States embrace this occasion to make that battle field a sacred national shrine. Let us build from this now overly ornated Capitol a national highway, to be known for

all time as the Lincoln Highway to Gettysburg. And on the spot where Lincoln stood when he delivered his memorial oration on that ever memorable November day let us erect a marble tablet, with every shining sentence of that immortal classic cut into the solid marble. [Applause.] Let us have a memorial to Abraham Lincoln with ideas in it—ideas of patriotic inspiration. Monuments have no sympathy, no emotion, no voice. Let us have tokens and symbols that are prescient with inspiration for the future of our country. The great present, with its growing zeal for humanity, with a culture deepened and broadened by science and enriched by all history, with its strong winged soul of prophecy, hot with the blood beats of a realized brotherhood claims us, calls us, and holds us. Let us not stagger back into pagan darkness to study art and sculpture from nations and civilizations long since dead that knew neither chastity nor charity nor Christ. Give us something with life in it—American ideas vibrant with the full-throated voice of patriotic inspiration. Let us make a national shrine of Gettysburg and build a broad highway to this Capitol and hallow it for all time with the revered name of Lincoln. [Continued applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, the fame of Abraham Lincoln is a growing one. Forty-seven years after his death his fame is greater to-day among his compatriots than ever before. Monuments have been built to Abraham Lincoln beginning almost with the time of his unhappy decease, and as years go by these monuments have been discarded by the American people as utterly inappropriate and insufficient to express the profound national appreciation of the wondrous character of Abraham Lincoln.

It was not that he was a ruthless conqueror, it was not that he was a pagan philosopher, it was not that he was a Lorenzo di Medici, patron of the fine arts, but that he was a great, profound student of human nature, with a sympathetic heart that beat in unison with the humblest citizen of his native land.

And as that impression has gone forth throughout all the rank and file of American citizenship, the monument to Lincoln's fame has gained an enduring foundation which will raise it to the eternal skies.

With all due respect to this Lincoln Commission, no one is prepared to admit that they have spoken the final word for the preservation of Lincoln's fame. It would not have been possible before the present time to secure an appropriation of \$2,000,000 to commemorate any American except Washington. These other monuments have cost trifling sums in comparison, but they are discarded as utterly inadequate for the purpose. Washington contains Lincoln monuments, one at the courthouse and one on Lincoln Square. There is no dearth of Lincoln monuments, big and little, but they have not commanded the love and veneration of the American people as being expressive of the American ideal of Lincoln.

I am opposed to this Greek temple on one hand and I am in favor of the highway on the other. My views are simply stated: First, I believe the Greek temple is wholly inappropriate and will be so deemed by the American people. Second, I believe that the highway is nearer to a perpetual monument of Lincoln, nearer to expressing the epoch of American history, than any other form of memorial capable in or about the National Capital.

When this committee was chosen for the task of spending \$2,000,000 of the people's money for a memorial in the city of Washington, they were confronted at once with the difficulty of spending that large sum without producing something that would detract from the National Capitol and the Washington Monument. It was a matter of some difficulty to spend such a sum and get any adequate return upon the money without erecting something that would produce an unfavorable comparison with the Washington Monument. Finally the committee hit on the Greek temple plan, or the Greek temple plan was conceived in the minds of the Fine Arts Commission, and the committee were induced to sanction it.

Mr. Speaker, the Greek temple form of construction is a very familiar one to architects, as I understand. It has been adapted to all kinds of public buildings, treasuries, churches, libraries, and art galleries. It has been duplicated countless times in the city of Washington and in every other great capital in the world. It will be duplicated countless times. It is the most hackneyed form of architectural art known now to architects. Architecture or art is, or should be, some expression of the age and clime which gives it birth. The Greek temple consists of a large rectangular building with a heavy, flat roof supported by columns. It is the product of a land of perpetual sunshine, where light and air are free and where the only desirable quality of the building is shade. We have transplanted that



form to our land of gray skies, to a land of wintry storms, to a land of artificial light and artificial heat, and we have adapted it successfully to many public buildings.

If the designs of this art commission are carried out, we shall have a great mall reaching from here to the Washington Monument, lined on both sides with buildings of Greek temple construction—one for the Department of Commerce and Labor, one for the Department of Justice, one for the Department of the Interior, one for the Department of Agriculture. There will be perhaps six or eight great white marble Greek temples stretching down from here to the Washington Monument. Then on the other side of the Monument will be another Greek temple if this resolution be adopted, only that Greek temple will be empty. It will contain only a heroic statue of Lincoln clad in American clothes, and it will be called a memorial to Abraham Lincoln. The Fine Arts Commission have so committed themselves to the Greek temple form of construction for Washington that they will turn every building in the Capital into a Greek temple in the course of time if their plans are carried out. Nobody would be able to tell whether that Lincoln memorial was an addition to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing or whether it was a storage place for congressional seeds until he got inside of it. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing, just now approaching completion, is a modification of the Greek temple with its heavy columns. The architectural absurdity of trying to adapt that plan to every conceivable building could not be better illustrated than in what happened at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, for in a building of that kind the most desirable thing is light, and the thing that the Greek temple excludes is light. They have actually gone to the length of moving the glass windows out to fill up the intervening spaces between the columns in order to secure the necessary light for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I am informed, my colleagues, that your Fine Arts Commission actually drew plans for a school building in the District of Columbia in the form of the Greek temple, and when it was found it would require artificial light in the daytime for the children to study they discarded the scheme and burned up the plans. So the Greek temple, beautiful as it may be, is not adapted to every possible purpose, and certainly it is not adapted to a commemoration of a great American commoner. A week ago this day, when this matter was supposed to come up, one of the greatest artists in the country, Guston Borglum, was in the city of Washington. He is the man who molded that wonderful rugged head of Lincoln that stands in the rotunda of this Capitol, the most remarkable head of Lincoln that has ever been produced. I take it he is an artist whose artistic criticism is of some value. Borglum said that the Greek temple project does not contain \$10,000 worth of art in the whole \$2,000,000 worth of appropriation. He says that is a stonemason's job. The hackneyed temple design is simply enlarged to use up the requisite amount appropriated. If Congress had appropriated \$4,000,000, it could have made it twice as big. Yet that interview was taken by every reporter to the papers in Washington and went into the waste-paper basket. Borglum says the epoch of Lincoln is filled with all the marvelous tragedies of the human heart.

It shows a great people emerging from the most tremendous struggle in history to solve the great problem of self-government, and the great problem of justice and equality to the weak, and that, being vital with everything that speaks of American life and American history, has been embalmed and ossified into a Greek temple borrowed from a distant age, and a pagan age at that.

I am opposed to the Greek temple as wholly inappropriate under any aspect to express the American sentiment for Lincoln. My colleagues, this Greek temple proposition is not primarily a memorial to Lincoln at all. It is a part of a much larger scheme, called, I believe, the "McMillan plan" for the beautification, as they call it, of Washington by turning it into a vast mausoleum. If Congress had appropriated \$2,000,000 for a memorial to Alexander Hamilton or Thomas Jefferson, or, perhaps, as the gentleman from Illinois suggested, Jefferson Davis, the Fine Arts Commission would have dished up the same identical Greek temple. It is not any more appropriate for Lincoln, in fact less appropriate for Lincoln, than any American that could possibly be named. It need not be assumed that these \$2,000,000 of the people's money which would be expended for this useless purpose will be the end of the matter. That building will have to be heated, lighted, plumbed, furnished with caretakers, attendants, guards, watchmen, and fuel; \$18,000 or \$20,000 a year in the sundry civil bill will not take care of that building. It is not to be assumed that this is the end of the expense of a useless building. It is designed to commit Con-

gress to a scheme for the purchase of property in the District and for the enlargement of the park area of the District, and for the acquisition of more or less unsalable property in the District, of which the end can not be foreseen.

Why, there is a companion bill to this, that I mentioned yesterday, which has come over from the Senate, to appropriate \$2,300,000 to move the Botanical Gardens into Rock Creek Park. That is one step contemplated under the present arrangement. How much more we have no way of telling.

On the other hand, I am in favor of the roadway, not simply because it has been indorsed by the Grand Army and by organized labor, and by other American bodies, but because I believe that there is no point within reach of the National Capital which is so identified with the epoch of Lincoln and with his character and career as the great battle field of Gettysburg. When foreigners come to our shores they do not come to see how well we can imitate the temples of ancient Greece; they do not come to see how well we can copy the Sistine Madonna or the Last Supper. They come to see something vital of American life, American ideals, and American history. When Americans travel about their own country they are not to be shown copies of the art of some distant age and clime, but something that will remind them of the struggle and career and triumph of Americans, and American history and American ideals.

The most extraordinary figures have been given out in the report of the Library Committee. I can not now stop to analyze them. It is said that this road would cost \$35,000,000. That is the mildest statement in this report. In my State, where we have good roads, we build them for \$4,500 a mile—that is, with a 12-foot surface, with an oil binder.

If you would make this road cost \$20,000 a mile, the entire cost would be less than \$1,500,000. There would be given unlimited contributions by States, by regiments, by patriotic societies, that would make this memorial to Lincoln not only a memorial to eternity but a memorial which would constantly be more and more of a memorial, and not be discarded at some future date as utterly inadequate to express the national sentiment toward Lincoln. It could be made one of the show places of America, if not of the entire world.

This memorial, this beautiful boulevard, would reach from the Nation's Capital to the Nation's greatest battlefield, to the culmination of that mighty struggle which solved for all time the question of the unity of the American Nation. Not a foreigner who came to our shores but would make a pilgrimage over that mighty boulevard from the Capital to the battle field or from the battle field to the Capital. Not an American citizen, not even an American schoolboy, but would feel that the longing wish of his heart was to see the great battle field of Gettysburg and then the great Capital of the Nation under whose flag he lives.

That great battle field would be an object of pleasure and interest besides being an opening of America to Americans. We send every year thousands of Americans and millions of American dollars to Europe, and yet we have more in this country to show them of natural beauty and heroic and historic triumph than they have in any country elsewhere on the civilized globe.

That boulevard would reach from the Capital to that great battle field which was immortalized not only by the burning words of Lincoln but by the dauntless heroism of the citizen soldiers of America, who on that great field for three long days, under a burning July sun, hurled themselves against each other in the greatest war of modern times, and proved to themselves and to all the world that they were one in race, one in courage, and one in destiny. [Applause.] Upon that great historic field during this current year will meet the veterans of the North and the veterans of the South, to clasp hands forever across the bloody chasm and to mark the realization and the fulfillment of the dearest wish of Abraham Lincoln—a peaceful, prosperous, reunited American Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I thank you. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] offers his amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following: "That the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln Memorial determined upon and recommended to Congress December 4, 1912, by the commission created by the act entitled 'An act to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln,' approved February 9, 1911, be, and the same are hereby, disapproved, and the said commission is hereby continued, with directions to select a location in the city of Washington, D. C., and to secure plans and designs for the erection of a Lincoln national

memorial hall and to make recommendation and report thereon to Congress at the session beginning the first Monday in December, 1913; said hall to be erected and dedicated to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, and to be suitable for use as an auditorium for all such national and international public assemblies and uses as Congress may hereafter designate."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order upon the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves a point of order upon the amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I shall address myself to the necessity for the amendment that I have offered to the pending resolution. The commission alluded to in the amendment was created by act of Congress approved February 9, 1911. The members of that commission are WILLIAM H. TAFT, SHELBY M. CULLOM, JOSEPH G. CANNON, GEORGE P. WETMORE, SAMUEL W. McCALL, Hernando De Soto Money, who has since died, and I do not remember at the present time the name of the gentleman who has taken his place, and CHAMP CLARK.

Under the terms of the act they were created a commission to be known as the Lincoln Memorial Commission. Their duties were to prescribe and determine upon the location, plan, and design of the memorial in the city of Washington, D. C., to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, subject to the approval of Congress; and if my amendment is adopted by this House it will continue this body in office for the purpose of determining where and how this Lincoln memorial building should be erected.

This commission, under the act creating it approved February 9, 1911, has the further authority to employ the services of such architects, sculptors, and others as it shall determine to be necessary, and to avail itself of the advice and services of the Commission on Fine Arts created by the act of March 3, 1910. And the act further provides that the construction of the monument or memorial shall be upon such site as shall be determined by the commission and approved by Congress, and its construction shall be entered upon as speedily as practicable after the plan and design therefor is determined upon and approved by Congress.

This amendment provides that the site shall be selected by this commission, that they shall secure plans and designs for the erection of a Lincoln national memorial hall, and make recommendations and report thereon at the session beginning the first Monday in December, 1913, said hall to be erected and dedicated to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, and to be suitable for use as an auditorium for all such national and international public assemblies and uses as Congress may hereafter designate.

Under my amendment, if adopted, this commission will be fully authorized and continued in power for the purpose of locating a Lincoln national memorial hall in this city for such public uses as Congress may hereafter designate.

I believe that if this amendment is adopted and this commission is given the authority provided in the amendment and the act creating it that they can and will report back to Congress the first Monday in December of this year, a plan for a hall to be erected and used for public purposes in this city that will be an honor to Abraham Lincoln, and also that will be of vast benefit to the people of this city as well as to the people of the whole United States. In my judgment enough has been said—and I will not reiterate any of the arguments—against the plan that has been adopted by this commission for a Grecian temple. Suffice it to say that it is in a location in Washington that I dare say but very few persons have visited or will ever visit. It is, I think, at least 2,000 feet from the Washington Monument and something like a mile from this place, and located on very low ground on the banks of the Potomac River, where only a great driveway is now located. It could not be used for any useful purpose. It is not in a position where it would be ornamental, because it is too far away from the Capitol. As between the two, I would vastly prefer to see the public-memorial road built from here to the battle field of Gettysburg. But that opens up a very dangerous proposition in my judgment.

Mr. RODENBERG. Could this hall that the gentleman has in mind be utilized for the purpose of an inaugural hall?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This Grecian temple can not be used for the purpose of any assemblage whatever. It would only be a thing of beauty and of no practical utility, while the hall I propose would and could be used for inauguration or any other public purpose authorized by Congress.

Mr. RODENBERG. I mean the hall that the gentleman has in mind. Could that be used for inaugural halls?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It could be used for all public purposes that Congress might be asked to designate. It could

be used in the same way that the English people are using the Albert Memorial Hall in London.

But with reference to the public-road proposition, it is evident to my mind, from a document that I hold in my hand, published recently by Congress—Report No. 1294, Sixty-second Congress, third session—that there is more behind this memorial-road proposition than appears on the surface. In this report it is stated that—

Two general plans for this memorial will be presented for the consideration of Congress. One plan restricts the memorial to a purely ornamental structure in Washington.

I have said enough on that proposition, because I do not believe this House will adopt any plan providing for a building of no practical utility. The report says, further, that—

The other plan contemplates the construction of a great highway or boulevard, leading from a superb memorial structure in Washington to the spot at Gettysburg where Lincoln delivered his immortal address, which "crystallized the spirit of the Republic into a paragraph." Through its extensions by the various States this will rapidly develop into a transcontinental highway—

Here the object of this resolution is fully exposed, because it points out that—

This will rapidly develop into a transcontinental highway and become the nucleus of a great national system of public roads which will bind together all sections of the Nation. Every city, town, and hamlet in the country will build a highway to connect with some extension of the Lincoln Road.

Now, let us inquire who is behind this great national highway proposition, to extend to every hamlet, town, and city in this country public roads built from money voted from the United States Treasury.

This document, gotten up and backed by the automobile manufacturers of the United States, further says that—

We are therefore conducting a national campaign of publicity and organization to get the wishes of the people before Congress. As a part of this campaign it is very desirable to send a personal letter with a leaflet and form like the inclosed to 1,000 leading citizens in each of 275 congressional districts, asking those addressed to take this matter up with their Congressmen and Senators. To put these letters with inclosures in the mail costs about \$45 per 1,000, or a total of \$12,375.

This literature comes from the Lincoln Memorial Road Association, and it is the source of the sentiment that is backing this great Lincoln memorial road from Washington to Gettysburg. The secretary of this Lincoln Memorial Road Association is Lester T. McCleary, and he is taking advantage of this bill in order to advocate and push forward the great automobile proposition they are trying to advance in this country. Here is what the document further says:

Having in mind the far-reaching importance of this matter, one of the good-roads committee connected with the automobile industry has subscribed \$2,500 to aid our publicity campaign. Many of the leading automobile clubs and individual manufacturers have subscribed varying amounts. You may have subscribed directly or indirectly, but even if that is the case it is vital to the success of this movement that you subscribe a substantial amount in addition, as more money is urgently needed, and a popular subscription could not be raised in time to be available.

Over 100 Members of the National House of Representatives, including the Speaker of the House, and many of the leading Senators of both parties have already expressed themselves in favor of the memorial road. We would like to make it as nearly unanimous as possible.

I hope you will give this movement your strong moral and financial support and that you will act at once.

In addition to making a substantial subscription now, I hope that each of your executive officers will write a personal letter to his Congressman and his two United States Senators urging them to favor the plan for the Lincoln memorial which includes the road to Gettysburg, and that you will arrange to have each of your representatives and agents throughout the country do the same.

Now, it is clear that the Automobile Good Roads Association is behind this memorial road for the purpose here fully disclosed, of extending the great national highway to every hamlet and village in this country. I do not believe there has ever been a more dangerous set of bills introduced in Congress than the bills providing for spending untold millions of dollars for building public roads in the States out of the Public Treasury.

If we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] it would be an entering wedge for the appropriation of hundreds of millions for public roads, and I hope that it will not be agreed to.

The advisability and practicability of building a great national memorial hall in this city is not doubted, and no one can truthfully say that it is not needed. A Greek temple is not needed. A great automobile road is not needed. It would not be built for the use of the common people of this country, but for the use of automobile owners. Abraham Lincoln was an extremely practical man, and prided himself on being one of the great mass of the common people of this Nation, and we do him no honor by erecting the Grecian memorial structure proposed by this resolution.

It is necessary for us to adopt something that the whole people of the United States will be benefited by. But a few



days ago we had the question before us as to where we would have the inaugural ceremonies. If this hall had been erected it could be used for that purpose. We have river and harbor congresses and other like great public assemblies that are called to meet in this city. All of these organizations and meetings are semipublic, and if this Lincoln national memorial hall is erected it would be an easy matter for Congress to direct that all such assemblies could use it for their meetings.

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will.

Mr. SHARP. Is the gentleman aware of the measure introduced by Senator Roor, providing for a memorial to George Washington, which contemplates the erection of a building substantially like the one now advocated by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I was not aware of that; but I think the Washington Monument standing in this city could not be improved upon. I have heard from no quarter any demand for the erection of another monument to Washington.

Mr. SHARP. It has already passed the Senate.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. So has this Lincoln memorial resolution passed the Senate. I think there is a public sentiment behind the Lincoln memorial resolution, but I know of none for the erection of another monument to Washington. I know of no better or any more lasting memorial which could be erected to the memory of Lincoln—or any more beneficial one—than to have a great hall, such as the Albert Memorial Hall in London, dedicated to his memory. Mr. Thornbury, a writer on old and new London, describes in his book the Prince Albert Memorial Hall.

Mr. CANTRILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CANTRILL. I would like to ask the gentleman if, in his judgment, it would not be a better public policy to appropriate money for the construction of buildings in Washington to alleviate the suffering of thousands of Government employees who are now employed under certain conditions that are absolutely inhuman? Would it not be better to do that than to expend this vast sum of money simply to beautify the city?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman is correct, and he takes the same position that I have always taken.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, I would like to make one further remark. This is the only time that I will have to call attention to certain facts. I will state that there are hundreds of employees—and I can name the places—housed in this city to-day, who are working under conditions that are absolutely inhuman. I can point the gentleman to a department where Government employees have been working at a temperature of 112 degrees and where they are selected for that employment on account of the stature of the men, because no man of moderate height can go in there and work under the roof under which they have to work.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I presume the gentleman is referring to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. CANTRILL. No. There are other places also. There was another department where, on the sixth floor, there were 165 men and women employed. The fifth floor, directly underneath them, was covered with inflammable material—oil, blankets, and other things. The fire escapes to the sixth floor were locked, and at the drop of a match those people would have been cremated in an instant. There are dozens of cases of that kind here in Washington, and I want to ask the gentleman if it would not be better public policy, if it would not be better for the American Congress, to give its time to the alleviation of human suffering on the part of hundreds of Government employees and remedy these inhuman conditions rather than to squander millions of the people's money in the erection of a memorial to anybody at this time?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that bills are now pending for the erection of buildings to take the place of those to which the gentleman refers, and I hope that in a very short time those buildings will be erected and that the conditions of the people who work in those buildings will be improved and that the clerks will have comfortable rooms in which to perform their duties.

Mr. CANTRILL. The point I wanted to bring out is whether we would not better take care of them now, remedy those conditions first, and then, if the Government finances permit, later on take up and consider these matters that are in the nature of a luxury, so to speak.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, the Committee on Public Buildings has now under consideration plans to erect buildings as fast as it can be done to take care of every Government employee in the city. I will state,

further, to the gentleman that several years ago, when we authorized the building of the House Office Building, that I tried to defeat the measure, but we did not have enough Members on the floor opposed to the building to call the roll upon the question and force a record vote. I took the position then, and I take it now, that every public building where clerks are employed in this city should be erected before we erect a public building for ourselves, and I believed then and I believe now—although the office buildings were needed—that we commenced at the wrong end of these building enterprises, and that we should first have housed comfortably every clerk in the employ of this Government before constructing a marble palace for ourselves.

Mr. CANTRILL. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas whether he does not know it to be a fact that there are now working in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, in one large room, from 400 to 500 men and women under conditions which are worse than those that prevail in any sweat shop in the country—absolutely barbarous, a disgrace and a shame to the Federal Government? Is not that the fact?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the conditions are bad, and the gentleman must understand that we are now constructing one of the largest and best buildings in the city for the purpose of taking care of those people in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving.

Mr. Speaker, referring again briefly to the Albert Memorial Hall, I desire to state that after the Prince Consort died the question was raised in Great Britain as to what kind of a memorial should be erected to him. Queen Victoria survived him for many years. It was her desire and the wish of the English Nation that some proper memorial should be erected to the memory of Prince Albert. They agreed upon the Albert Memorial Hall as the best kind of memorial. It is a building on the edge of Hyde Park and is known as the Royal Albert Hall of Art and Sciences, and owes its origin to the fund which was raised in 1862 for the purpose of erecting in Hyde Park the national memorial to the late Prince Consort, which we have already described. With every desire that this recognition of the debt which English art, science, and industry owed to the Prince should be, in every sense of the word, such a memorial as the country itself preferred, the Queen requested a committee of gentlemen to suggest the form which the testimonial should assume.

And that testimonial took the form of a great building, such as suggested in my amendment. The author of the book I hold in my hand further says:

After deliberating upon the matter, the committee recommended the erection of a personal memorial to the Prince Consort in Hyde Park, opposite what is best known as the Central Hall of Arts and Sciences.

A pardonable degree of curiosity was aroused respecting the ultimate destiny of the hall; but this was set aside when it was announced that the new building was intended, amongst other things, to accommodate science congresses, to provide a suitable arena for musical performances, and to serve other equally useful artistic and scientific purposes.

Such as the hall I propose can be used, and possibly will be used, under the direction of Congress.

For this the building is admirably adapted from the immense disposable space it offers. Between 6,000 and 7,000 people can be seated in the hall, and, besides this, when the necessity arises, it is possible to place as many as 2,000 spectators in comfortable positions on an incline staging in the picture gallery, which runs nearly around the hall.

And he goes on to say, further:

Guided by the principles upon which the Romans constructed those amphitheatric buildings, the remains of which strike modern spectators with awe and admiration, the designers of the Albert Hall have succeeded in raising a structure of eminently beautiful and attractive proportions. Seen from the park or the Kensington Road, the hall stands boldly out in all the magnificence which invests a building in the style of Italian Renaissance.

The Kensington Road enters the park at the point where this building is erected. It goes on to say:

In the plan of the interior it can be seen at once that the architect has taken for his model the old Roman amphitheater, though with such important modifications as, happily, quite another kind of entertainment, and, unhappily, less genial skies required. Roman plebeians and aristocrats were mere spectators, looking down on the fierce and bloody spectacles provided for their amusement in the arena. Here it was necessary so to provide that people might both hear and see, but above all things hear. Such a condition gives the key to the arrangement of the interior. Imagine, then, within an outer shell of staircases, corridors, refreshment and retiring rooms, a vast hall in shape of a graceful oval, of which the southern end is all but filled by the organ and orchestra, rising upward in tiers of seats. Fronting this orchestra is the auditorium, of horseshoe form, composed of arena, a level space; the amphitheater, or, as it might be better termed, the stalls, sloping upward toward the boxes; three tiers of boxes; above them the balcony; and, lastly, above it what is called the picture gallery. This gallery is not within the proper limits of the ellipse forming the interior, but is built over the staircases and corridors, which form an outer zone to the portions of the auditorium below. It

runs, therefore, around the whole of the interior, and the 30 Italian arches, with their scagliola pillars, through which the body of the hall is seen, are really its great ornaments.

The boxes and balcony project from the wall into the ellipse, each tier extending 3 feet beyond that above it. Such an arrangement enables the occupants of each tier to see without much difficulty, and be seen by those above them. One of the most remarkable features of the hall, in fact, is the perfect view of the interior, and of all within it, which can be had from any point.

Since the day of the opening of the hall by Her Majesty, when the orchestra was occupied by 1,200 instrumentalists and vocalists, concerts on a grand and extensive scale have been the chief use to which the building has been put; and it was also used for part of the display in the annual industrial exhibitions of 1871 to 1874. The grandest scenes, perhaps, which have taken place within its walls were on the occasions of the State concerts given in honor of the visits to England of the Shah of Persia, the Czar of Russia, etc.; more recently the most notable functions have been the reception of Mr. Stanley and the concert on the occasion of the German Emperor's visit to England.

If we adopt my amendment, a similar building would constitute a splendid memorial of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. When was the hall completed?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. In 1867, I believe; it was started in 1862, if I remember rightly.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me? In 1875, the first and only time I crossed the water, I visited London and was over there three weeks and saw the memorial to the late Prince Consort just off Hyde Park, not a hall, as beautiful a memorial as I ever saw. I did not know that hall was ever built until this minute.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that that stands directly in front of the memorial, and that it contains the great auditorium which I have been describing. I have a picture of it here.

Mr. CANNON. I am just telling the gentleman of my experience, and I was about an average mast-fed fellow, who crossed over there to see things. I saw that splendid monument, with no utility about it, and I never knew that the hall existed.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I regret that the gentleman overlooked that magnificent hall. He certainly was not with a Cook party and being conducted through the city of London to see its famous buildings, as I was a few years ago. It is the most wonderful hall in that city, and said to be the most wonderful in the world.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY] five minutes, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I listened, as did every Member of this House, with intense earnestness and with great admiration for the ability displayed by the distinguished and learned son of Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] in portraying the necessity that the memorial should take the form of a Greek temple. And we listened with the same rapt interest to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] as he told the story of the temple erected in London, wherein he pointed out the fact that there is no hall available for a meeting place in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to attend a meeting held in a convention hall, that was capable of holding 5,000 zealous, enthusiastic Clark supporters for President, that is located in Washington and which is of sufficient size to accommodate most any character of gathering.

Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that we have rather strayed away from the significance that should attach to a memorial to Abraham Lincoln. The one salient feature that stands most preeminently forth in a study of the characteristics and of the life and of the struggles of that great somber, sorrowful man, who belongs to the centuries, whose deeds, achievements, and greatness overshadow those of any man of any nationality that ever trod God's footstool, was his love of humanity.

It permeates every act of the life of Lincoln, and we best remember this grand old citizen of America, whose first vision of life was a little log cabin in a Kentucky forest, a cabin that had no blinds and that typified simplicity itself, but where was born in surroundings equally as humble as those of the Nazarene the Nation's first citizen.

And this great, soulful character best portrays his affection for all the people in the closing words of his Gettysburg address:

A government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

And if a memorial is to be erected or constructed to commemorate the great life, the great character, the great achievements of a sublime individual, like the great American, Lincoln, let it be something that will typify his service, because service, after all, was the most predominant trait in the life of Lincoln, and that service was dedicated to humanity.

Admitting that a Greek temple, as is here proposed and which unquestionably will be adopted, is agreed upon, I ask in what

way does it typify the splendid sacrifice for humanity and freedom of this sublime character, whose heart bled during the great internecine struggle for all the people?

The Appian Way, leading from the Forum through the centuries, has not only commemorated but proved of service to the people of Rome.

Lincoln needs no monument. His service for humanity has enshrined him in the hearts of the American people and in the hearts of liberty lovers in every portion of the civilized world. His keeping the Nation whole, his striking off the shackles from a race of people, and this sublime and splendid Republic, united and free, standing forth a beacon of hope to the oppressed and downtrodden seeking the light and justice, is the best testimonial that could ever be constructed by human or divine hands in the hearts and memories of a grateful people. [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I will say in advance I do not expect to consume an hour of time. All are desirous of reaching a vote this afternoon, and many Members have expressed a desire for time.

While here and there among the membership of the House there are those who differ as to the details of the proposed memorial, although concurring in the finding that it should be erected in Washington, it is manifest that the best organized and most aggressive opposition to the plan proposed comes from those who for one cause or another are in favor of the highway to Gettysburg. I do not question the high-minded and patriotic impulses of the Members of this House who favor that proposition. It is well, however, for the people of the country to know something of the influences that have been the most active in the campaign that has been carried on to promote the highway project. I therefore desire to insert in the Record at this time an extract from a letter written by the executive secretary of the Lincoln Memorial Road Association of America. I am free to confess that when the road to Gettysburg was first suggested I was favorably impressed. I am a believer in good roads, and perhaps my feelings on the general subject of good roads influenced to some extent a friendly feeling for the Gettysburg highway. This predisposition was soon changed when the question was taken up for serious consideration.

The letter, after calling attention to the importance, from a good-roads point of view, of the Federal Government taking an initial step, proceeds as follows:

We are therefore conducting a national campaign of publicity and organization to get the wishes of the people before Congress. As a part of this campaign it is very desirable to send a personal letter with a leaflet and form like the inclosed to 1,000 leading citizens in each of 275 congressional districts, asking those addressed to take this matter up with their Congressmen and Senators. To put these letters with inclosures in the mail costs about \$45 per 1,000, or a total of \$12,375. Having in mind the far-reaching importance of this matter, one of the good-roads committee connected with the automobile industry has subscribed \$2,500 to aid our publicity campaign. Many of the leading automobile clubs and individual manufacturers have subscribed varying amounts. You may have subscribed directly or indirectly, but even if that is the case it is vital to the success of this movement that you subscribe a substantial amount in addition, as more money is urgently needed and a popular subscription could not be raised in time to be available.

This extract speaks for itself and discloses that the campaign, for such it can very properly be called, that has been conducted by this so-called Lincoln Memorial Road Association is in the interest of good roads and the automobile industry. It also throws some light on the source from which the funds emanated to defray the expense. The letter concludes as follows:

In addition to making a substantial subscription now, I hope that each of your executive officers will write a personal letter to his Congressman and his two United States Senators, urging them to favor the plan for the Lincoln memorial which includes the road to Gettysburg and that you will arrange to have each of your representatives and agents throughout the country do the same.

That they have done so is evidenced not only by other documentary proof of record but by the numerous letters and telegrams that have been pouring in to Members of Congress from automobile concerns, urging them to appropriately memorialize Lincoln by building a highway to Gettysburg. [Applause.]

Yesterday while my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] was addressing the House he inserted in the Record and criticized a letter written by the Fairmount Park Art Association, of Philadelphia, to the Members of Congress from Penn-



sylvania, expressing views in opposition to the Gettysburg highway as a memorial to Lincoln. A little later in his remarks the gentleman inserted in the RECORD what seemed to me a rather remarkable letter, which I desire at this time to read:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND BUSINESS MEN'S CLUB,  
San Antonio, Tex., January 24, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM P. BORLAND, M. C.,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have yours of the 16th inclosing Library Committee's report on the Greek temple proposition, for which accept thanks. I appreciate your sending me this report very much, and I immediately got busy and distributed these reports among our influential—

Citizens who are interested in securing the best and most appropriate memorial to Lincoln? Oh, no—among our influential good-roads enthusiasts—

Think of it! What a bald confession! Not even an attempt to mask the real designs.

The letter proceeds—

and in a few hours gathered them up and redistributed them—

The gentleman is certainly not lacking in activity or zeal for good roads—

and in addition to that I had one of our daily papers print the report and also print a statement from myself and others who had picked this report all to pieces and explained to the people the ridiculous part of it.

This is certainly rich—

Almost every organization of any kind whatsoever in San Antonio has wired Representative SLAYDEN insisting that he support the Washington to Gettysburg highway, and these telegrams have been constantly going to Mr. SLAYDEN for over two weeks, and more especially since it was referred back to his committee. The Washington Post clipping you sent me was published in one of our daily papers the day I received your clipping.

Evidently even gentlemen here have been interested in seeing that the press of the country are kept in touch with their proposition through the various good-roads enthusiasts.

Yesterday there was a telegram sent to Hon. JOHN N. GARNER, which reads as follows:

"We appreciate your efforts in behalf of the Lincoln memorial highway and pledge our assistance at any time we can be of help to this cause.

"J. W. WARREN,  
President Texas Good Roads Association.  
"CHAS. GRAEBNER,  
President Chamber of Commerce.  
"A. M. FISCHER,  
President Bear County Highway League.  
"CHAS. O. AUSTIN,  
President Real Estate Exchange.  
"ATLEE B. AYRES,  
President Fiscal Division of C. C."

In addition to this quite a number of Mr. GARNER's admirers are writing him personal letters. In addition, our highway division, the real estate exchange, Chamber of Commerce, Fiesta Association, and the San Antonio Automobile Club have asked me to express their gratitude to you for the noble work that you are doing for this highway.

Not for a Lincoln memorial, but for "this highway."

We all assure you that we appreciate it, and I hope that I will have the pleasure of meeting you on March 6 and 7 at the good-roads convention, which will be held in Washington.

Yours, very truly, D. E. COLP, Secretary.

Whether intentionally or unintentionally there is manifest from this letter a very distinct back fire on the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. SLAYDEN, who for 14 years has been an honored Member of this House, and who, as chairman of this committee, has been conscientiously seeking to discharge his duty.

I submit that it is evident from the letter of the Lincoln Memorial Road Association, as well as from the letter I have just read and many other things with which the Members of this House are familiar, that this movement for the highway to Gettysburg has been promoted largely by good-roads enthusiasts, the automobile industry, and other business concerns.

When we witness the zeal with which they are seeking to use the sacred name of Lincoln to enhance their profits, it almost recalls the ghoulish humor from the grave scene in Hamlet.

Imperial Caesar dead and turned to clay  
Might stop a hole to keep the winds away.

This House will never permit the sainted memory of Lincoln to be commercialized for pecuniary profit. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield to me for a minute?

Mr. PICKETT. With pleasure.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman also read the letter from the Fairmont Park Art Association?

Mr. PICKETT. I will not read it in my time. It is printed in the RECORD as a part of the gentleman's remarks of yesterday, and I referred to it.

Mr. BORLAND. I trust the gentleman in fairness will read the literature in reference to the Greek temple side of the controversy.

Mr. PICKETT. You had an opportunity to read it.

Mr. BORLAND. I did read it yesterday.

Mr. PICKETT. And I am now replying.

I will add, however, that there is nothing in the letter issued by the Fairmont Park Association which does not go to the merits of the proposition, and certainly there is nothing which reflects any personal interest that the members of the association have in any line of business that will be promoted by any action taken by Congress in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the memorial proposed in the pending resolution comes before the House not as the product of hasty action by the committee to which it was referred. It has been considered for years and embodies the best thought and contributions of the highest authorities on such subjects. It comes before this House with the deliberate and ripened judgment of the distinguished citizens who compose the Lincoln Memorial Commission, representing all parties and all sections, and which held 16 meetings during the consideration of the subject; with the approval of the gentlemen who compose the Fine Arts Commission, selected for their high repute in the world of art; with the approval of the Senate, whose unanimity of action reflects its cordial indorsement of the memorial; and, lastly, with the unanimous recommendation of your own committee, which has given to the subject its best thought and endeavor.

I do not know how many of the Members of the House have read the document which I hold in my hand, containing the report of the Lincoln Memorial Commission; extracts from the report of the Fine Arts Commission, and also extracts from the architect's description. It is difficult to conceive how anyone could read them without being carried irresistibly to a conclusion favorable to the memorial proposed. For the purpose of having it appear in the RECORD, I may be pardoned for quoting briefly two paragraphs therefrom, one a quotation from the late Hon. John Hay:

As I understand it, the place of honor is on the main axis of the plan. Lincoln, of all Americans next to Washington, deserves this place of honor. He was of the immortals. You must not approach too close to the immortals. His monument should stand alone, remote from the common habitations of man, apart from the business and turmoil of the city—isolated, distinguished, and serene. Of all the sites, this one, near the Potomac, is most suited to the purpose.

The other from the description of the architect who designed the memorial:

On the great axis, planned over a century ago, we have at one end the Capitol, which is the monument of the Government, and to the west, over a mile distant from the Capitol, is the monument to Washington, one of the founders of the Government. If the Lincoln memorial is built on this same axis still farther to the west, by the shore of the Potomac, we will there have the monument of the man who saved the Government, thus completing an unparalleled composition which can not fail to impart to each of its monuments a value in addition to that which each standing alone would possess.

There is a touch of the immortal in the isolation with which the architect enshrouds the names of Washington and Lincoln. The conception is lofty, one that grows upon you the more you study it. Washington was the commanding figure in the epoch which secured our independence and established our institutions. Lincoln was the potential figure in the epoch which tested the unity of our Republic and made our liberty real.

Washington and Lincoln will forever stand companionless in American history. They rise in their isolation as our two greatest citizens. [Applause.]

The word "immortal" is used with such abandon that its true significance is all too often lost. Time may be a cruel, but is a seldom erring, critic. To be immortal means more than to have achieved distinction in an epoch or a place among the great of an age or a cycle. It rests upon achievements which survive the receding years and live forever in the hearts of men. [Applause.]

Reflect for a moment upon the concept of the memorial. At one end of the main axis is the Capitol of the Nation, in the center the Monument to Washington, and at the other end the memorial to Lincoln. Looking into the future we can see the extension across the Potomac to Arlington, and then we will have at one end the Capitol, at the other Arlington, and in between the Monument to Washington and the memorial to Lincoln. The citizen, as he journeys thither, will first visit his Capitol with all that it symbolizes. He will then turn his eyes down the long vista to behold the Monument to Washington, the Father of his Country; beyond, the memorial to Lincoln, the savior of our Union; and yonder, in the distance on the green hillside of Virginia, once a part of Dixie but now and forever, thank God, a part of our common country, his eyes will stop at Arlington, where sleep the Nation's heroic dead. The Capitol, Washington, Lincoln, Arlington. What a sublime equation! What an immortal association! What a companionship for the ages! [Applause.]



The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], in his remarks this afternoon, suggested that the highway to Gettysburg "could be made one of the show places of the world." Think of it! The name of Lincoln utilized to make one of the "show places of the world." I do not know whether the gentleman from Missouri intended the meaning which the language imports, but this I know, it would be the result if the highway plan is adopted.

I do not care to discuss whether the highway could or could not be built within the appropriation. That question is of minor importance in the light of the graver consideration, How could it be protected by the Government from being used for purposes which would destroy any element of a Lincoln memorial? The Federal Government would have no jurisdiction over lands adjacent or contiguous to the highway, and they would be used, by the same spirit of commercialism which we have already seen manifest, for show places, amusement parks, and the like. The papers would be filled with advertisements of vaudeville performances and all the modern novelties of entertainment designed to attract the curious or pleasure-seeking crowd. In automobile phraseology it would be known as the "great joy ride of the country." I am unwilling that Lincoln's name should be thus desecrated. This is a good time and a fitting occasion for the Congress of the United States to give a practical lesson in American patriotism. [Applause.]

Contrast, if you please, the difference in the effect upon the mind and heart of the future citizen between an automobile trip over a highway to Gettysburg and a visit to the memorial proposed in the pending resolution. After visiting the Capitol of his country, with all its hallowed traditions and all that it brings to his heart, and then a visit to Washington's Monument, he pursues his way to Lincoln's memorial, rising with its lines of strength and beauty before him. In the center hall, 60 feet wide, 70 feet long, and 60 feet high—higher than this Chamber—he pauses in silent communion before a beautiful bronze statue of Lincoln. He then turns to read in bronze Lincoln's matchless speech at Gettysburg, and then in another place Lincoln's second inaugural, the closing paragraph of which is burnished in every American heart. That one sentence, "With malice toward none, with charity for all," has no counterpart in literature save the one which fell from the lips of the Great Master, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it is with such an inspiration I would leave the pilgrim patriot at the shrine of Lincoln. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] is recognized.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I desire time only to read a letter written me, by the adjutant of the largest Grand Army of the Republic post in the district I have the honor to represent, upon the subject under consideration, and which was approved by a unanimous vote of the membership of that post. The letter reads as follows:

SWITZ FURNITURE Co. (INC.),  
Kearney, Nebr.

In answer to a circular letter just received concerning the Lincoln memorial, will say that I am unalterably opposed to a pile of foreign marble for a memorial to Lincoln. In my opinion a pile of marble does not represent anything, especially of foreign importation. Build the living memorial, the Gettysburg road. This will become a living memorial because there will be constant additions and improvements to the Lincoln road.

The nations of the world will come to this country to look at an American monument or memorial. It will at once become an attraction to everybody and permit everybody to aid in beautifying the road, subject of course to the approval of a commission, who will have this in charge. The American people would add millions of dollars in beautifying this road. In that sense it would be in reality a living memorial. It would become a national road to commemorate a nation's hero, in which all would have an interest and pride. Nothing could be more fitting for a memorial to Lincoln than this road from the National Capitol to the place where the greatest battle of the war was fought, and where Lincoln delivered his immortal address after the battle.

This would be such a departure from the pile of marble, at the same time so appropriate, that I should think that everybody would see it in that light. If this plan could be put before the people, in my opinion it would receive the approval of the Nation.

Respectfully, yours,

F. J. SWITZ.

P. S.—After reading the above letter to the Smith Gavit Post, No. 209, it was moved and carried that the post indorse the letter of Comrade Switz. Carried unanimously.

F. J. SWITZ, Adjutant.

[Applause.]

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the resolution by inserting after the resolving clause the following:

"That recognizing in Abraham Lincoln the greatest advocate of equal opportunity for all the people, and in whose illustrious life and achievements are exemplified the highest possibilities of the American youth, the establishment of a national vocational school, in which shall be given, at the lowest tuition possible, practical instruction in the trades and agriculture, is the most appropriate memorial that can be erected to perpetuate his memory; and that the Lincoln Memorial Commission, created by the act approved February 9, 1911, is hereby authorized and directed to use all or any portion of the amount appropriated by the provisions of said act in formulating and executing all plans necessary to give effect to this resolution, subject to the approval of Congress."

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the line of demarcation between the two sides of the House is not identical with the line of difference upon this important measure, and I wish to say at the outset of my remarks, with the intention of being fair to those who champion one side or the other of the question, that it is not my purpose to consume the hour or any considerable portion of it in my remarks. I do not desire to be dilatory in any way, and I would be very glad to have this measure finally passed upon before we adjourn to-day. Whatever is left of my time I shall be pleased to surrender back to the House.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, by a coincidence that I had not before noticed until I looked at its date, that it is exactly one year ago to-day that I introduced the resolution which has just been read from the Clerk's desk. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the arguments presented by the champions of these two respective plans, which seem to be quite as far apart as the east from the west. I have been not a little amused to see the application of an old saw exemplified in the indulgence of the talk here, one side against the other—the pot calling the kettle black. It seems to me it all argues for the carrying through of a wholly different and better plan. I would not call my resolution a compromise measure. It has the features of neither of these measures that are advocated so eloquently to-day. Though it is widely different from either of them I have been not a little encouraged in the belief during the past week or two since the decision upon this measure became so imminent, and from reading editorials of leading papers throughout the country, that there is a very strong sentiment which, if it could only be molded and crystallized and directed along concrete lines, would defeat both of these propositions.

When I asked for some time in which to discuss the proposition, I frankly told the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] who had kindly consented to accommodate me, that I was against his proposition, which involved the construction of a \$2,000,000 highway. It would furnish no utilitarian purpose whatever, except to the automobilists, who have been characterized here as much too enthusiastic by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT]. But if I am against the expenditure of this great sum of \$2,000,000 for a highway—and I am willing to go a long way in subscribing to some of the views expressed and pictures so eloquently painted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] as to what might become of some of the unpleasant features of that highway—I am equally against any expenditure of the people's money for this great mass of granite and marble, such as we have depicted in the illustrations of the monument in our lobby outside of this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, if this question could be submitted to the vote of the American people, I very seriously doubt whether either one of these projects would receive a majority. Certainly, if the question were submitted to the rank and file of Americans—that class of our citizens which outnumbers the other class as nine to one throughout the United States, that class from which Abraham Lincoln, the emancipator of a great race, himself sprung—I believe an overwhelming majority would be against either one of these expensive and unwarranted propositions.

I want to say, lest my position be misunderstood, that no expenditure of money, no matter how large, could properly attest the attributes and the services of the greatest, in many ways, of all the Presidents of the United States. I am an admirer of Abraham Lincoln, and I am glad that the Nation's affection for his memory has taken form in such a magnificent appropriation. But, as has been well said by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and other speakers, it hardly comports with his character and achievements, with the high ideals set before the American people by Abraham Lincoln, that we should erect to his memory a monument such as they do abroad for Kings. Lincoln was of an entirely different class, differing from them as the American free people differ from the subjects of those monarchs. Perhaps the first speaker, Mr. McCALL, is correct in his view that we should not necessarily embody the utilitarian in the memorial which we should erect to Abraham Lincoln's memory. It may be the consummation of all that is sublime and poetic, as the gentleman pointed out, to portray a character in our history upon canvas or sculptured in marble so it almost speaks; but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if there is any one thing that ought to be placed above the mere pleasure and enjoyment of a highway on one side or the embodiment of sentiment and art on the other it is the elevation of mankind.

We have heard a great deal during the past few years about conservation projects. We are undertaking to conserve our streams, our water powers, and our forests; but, to my mind, we have not yet directed our conservation policy and our conservation energies, if I may use that expression, in the most



effective channels. Why, a conservation, my colleagues, the highest in degree of all, would be a conservation not alone of human energy, but of human character [applause], the building up of the great mass of people of our country by a proper recognition of their needs. That brings me to the consideration of my own resolution. My resolution has directly in point the building of a great vocational educational institution. I want to say to those who favor the establishment and the location of this memorial in the city of Washington, that if my resolution should be adopted and the plan therein contemplated carried out, it would not be necessary that this great institution should be located outside of Washington. If, indeed, the work to be done within its walls was to educate teachers in vocational work, then it would be a most appropriate location, because we have located here within a radius of a mile and a half all the great institutions and departments of the National Government.

I was reading some months ago the statistics showing the proportion of school children or children of school age attending, or who ought to be attending, our schools but failed, for some reason or other, to attend after the age of 14; and I am fortified by the official statistics when I say that 8 out of 10, not your children, of course, or mine, but the children of the great mass of the poor people—that class from whom Abraham Lincoln came himself—never again enter a school after that age. Eight out of ten of all the school children beyond a secondary grade have not, it literally means, the advantage of a school of any kind, though the doors ostensibly are open to them free of charge. Think of it, 8 out of 10! Why, my colleagues, if we have any more problems to solve in this Nation that will require time, that can not be solved within a day, I do not want you to forget that the hope of a proper solution of those problems rests in the boys and girls of to-day. In the history of a nation the development of a generation is but as a day; but if you expect great reforms they must all come from these little ones, because in the to-morrow they will take your seats here. If they are to govern wisely and well, they must have every benefit possible from our educational system.

Merely to open a school and say it is free of tuition to our children is not solving the problem. Theoretically it is giving one the same right as the other, but sooner or later we must come, gentlemen of this House, to adopt a system of training and education such as Germany and other foreign nations have entered upon successfully in the past 20 or 30 years. In my home town we have quite a number of factories which manufacture a superior quality of goods in certain lines, and if we seek to-day to get those who are specially skilled in those industries, where do we go? Why, we go to Germany or we go to France, where they specialize in that particular kind of work. So the resolution which I have introduced in the House to-day and for which I speak calls for a national indorsement, if you please, of a system that is as yet hardly practiced to any extent whatever in our own country.

I say it not in words of censure of our institutions. We are a new country. We have so many, many opportunities here for the advancement of young men just starting out in life; we have so many broad acres that are yet unpeopled by the millions to follow that we do not, of course, find ourselves driven by necessity, as do those crowded countries in Europe. But the problems are coming, and it is for us in all due and proper time to seize and take advantage of the kind of training such as we have seen so successfully carried out in Germany and the other countries referred to.

Every day you gentlemen have upon your desks before you petitions in favor of the Page educational bill, or the Lever bill, or some other similar measure favoring Government cooperation with the States. So this is not in any sense of the word an innovation. I say to you, my colleagues, if we could use the \$2,000,000 that we have for that purpose in the founding of the building of a great vocational school in the city of Washington, we would lay the foundation for a memorial which would even outlast the granite foundation and marble superstructure of the beautiful monument so eloquently advocated by other speakers.

I am not one of those who would criticize that monument. Architecturally considered—while I am in no position to speak with authority—I have not studied it very much; but it seems like a beautiful building. I do not know whether it would be better to go back for our models to the Egyptian times or find them in Grecian architecture, or in the more simple lines of the so-called colonial period. I will not undertake to pass upon that plan of the memorial.

My objection lies in the fact that the American Congress is about to appropriate the great sum of \$2,000,000 for that kind of a memorial, when if we wanted to memorialize Abraham Lincoln and recognize his services to humanity in that manner a very much less sum would answer the purpose just as well. I

do not think that you could improve upon the statue of Abraham Lincoln designed by St. Gaudens and erected in Lincoln Park, Chicago, and I am told that that cost about 3 per cent of what this would amount to; in other words, about \$60,000. Surely, for the ages to come, it seems to me that Cecil Rhodes, that great empire builder, who ran the modern highways of steel from the Southern Ocean northward across Africa into the land of the ancient Ptolemies, will be best known by the endowment of his Oxford scholarships when all his earthly achievements shall have been forgotten. You are all familiar, from reading at least, with his last resting place. In the cleft of a great granite rock, facing the south, in Cape Colony, I believe, among the scenes of his exploits as a miner and railroad builder, repose forever the remains of that great man.

But far away to the north, the country of his birth, in England, the conception of his lofty purpose will go on and on and on just as long as human institutions shall last. That is the character of a memorial I would like to see founded here, my colleagues. There have been a number of letters read on both sides, some in favor of the highway and some in favor of the Lincoln monument, but, if I may ask the indulgence of the House just for a few moments, I want to read from a communication of a former Member of this House, twice governor of the State of Massachusetts, a man who by foresight and industry has not only built up a great fortune for himself, but has also been a great help to the laborers and artisans of Massachusetts.

I wish to read now a few remarks from Gov. Foss, who wrote me upon the merits of this particular resolution. I shall not take the time of the House to read more than this one letter, but I want to say that without solicitation came all of those other letters from educational institutions throughout the country, from business firms, and from large manufacturing establishments. So far as my resolution is concerned, I have requested no petition to be sent to Congress. I have asked no petitions to be sent to any Member in favor of it, so that if it is not known to the extent that other propositions are known it is because there has been no effort made except to get for my own personal satisfaction the opinions of eminent educators and men who are at the heads of great industries in this country.

I read Gov. Foss's letter:

BOSTON, MASS., March 13, 1912.

HON. W. G. SHARP,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SHARP: Many thanks for the copy of your speech on the subject of establishing a vocational school as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln.

I hope your project will commend itself to the favorable consideration of Congress. If you succeed in securing some permanent Federal supervision for vocational guidance and for elementary training along industrial lines, you will have rendered a great service to this country.

I doubt whether there is any other public project which, in relation to its cost, offers a better assurance of public benefit, provided the plan is worked out along practical lines.

In Massachusetts we are particularly interested in educational work of a practical, industrial, and technical character. The legislature has recently voted \$1,000,000 to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in tacit recognition of its value to the State in training young men and women toward self-support.

That school is not a State institution, but the public is convinced of its importance to the State.

I believe that industrial education not only increases the average self-supporting power of the community, but that it has also a still more marked efficacy, for the reason that any normal man or woman cheerfully occupied in remunerative work has very little incentive to enter a life of crime.

Massachusetts now has in operation several public institutions known as industrial schools, to which are sent young boys and girls who have shown some minor disregard of law but who are not really criminals. In my judgment, it is a very wise use of public money, whether under State or Federal supervision, to start young people upon careers of usefulness.

Elementary work along vocational lines appears to be the best method of doing this. I believe that our industrial schools in this State enable us to get at the problems of evil doing and idleness before the police and the judiciary are compelled to deal harshly with them.

I take the liberty of sending you, as of possible interest, the full text of a speech which I read last year before the American Society of Anthropology and Criminology, together with some recent reports of our several industrial schools. I also send you copies of my two inaugural messages of 1911 and 1912, in which you will find my recommendations to the Legislature of Massachusetts in respect to still further efforts to forestall crime and at the same time build up the industrial efficiency of the Commonwealth.

It seems at first thought preposterous, but it is really true that in this country we are spending less money on education than we are on military preparations and expenses. I believe that we are not spending as much money on education as it is costing us to meet the direct and indirect losses from crime and pauperism. Inasmuch as education of a practical character is surely the best means of reducing these two last-named evils, I think you are working on the right track and I wish you success with all my heart.

Very truly, yours,

EUGENE N. FOSS.

That is a very interesting letter, indeed, and I have many others from prominent agricultural institutions, from men prominent as the heads of great industries, and from men who value the special services of those who have had this kind of training. Not to take the time longer of the House, and thank-



ing many of you who have been so patient as to listen to the advocacy of a proposition that is almost entirely new and not strongly favored on account of prior commitments to these other projects, I wish to say that in my opinion we could not do a better thing than to turn down both of these projects and establish a utilitarian institution which shall be for the uplift of mankind, that shall emphasize and embody in its character, for all time to come, the life and services of that greatest of all humanitarians—Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from Illinois would use some of his time.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, the very purpose of the amendment to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] having, as he declares, as its chief end the perpetuation of the memory of Abraham Lincoln, the secondary, if not an equal paramount purpose of perpetuating good roads, will, in my judgment, be an injury rather than an aid to establishing the policy of governmental aid to good roads. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States, on February 9, 1911, with a unanimity that bespeaks a reunited country, enacted into law a bill providing for the erection of a monument or memorial in the city of Washington, D. C., to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. It provided that the construction of the "monument or memorial herein and hereby authorized shall be upon such site as shall be determined by the commission herein created and approved by Congress." This commission thus created has made its report. That is the question now to be considered by this House. There was no thought or suggestion when this original question was considered of attempting to use the memory and fame of Abraham Lincoln as a subterfuge to further the cause of Government aid to good roads. I am a friend to good roads. I voted to appropriate many millions of dollars to be divided between the States for this laudable purpose. The question now under consideration is, Shall the House repudiate its former action; shall the reputation and glory of Abraham Lincoln be used as a makeshift to begin by indirection that which gentlemen fear they shall be unable to do directly in the open? [Applause.]

Lincoln was born in Kentucky. He went to the State of Illinois. Kentucky gave him to Illinois and Illinois gave him to the Republic and the Republic gave him to the world. If a road were to be built—if in earnest you desire to perpetuate his memory and to pay tribute to his character—I submit that the road ought not to go to that sea of carnage and flood of sorrow, the battle field of Gettysburg, but it ought to be built, if a road is what you want, from Springfield, Ill., where he lived and lies buried, back to the old Kentucky home where he first saw the light. [Applause.]

But we Kentuckians love the memory of Abraham Lincoln too well to desire to use that as a vehicle for the purpose of throwing upon the Government the maintenance of and assistance in building public highways. [Applause.] Why, the arguments made here this morning, Mr. Speaker, that Washington's Monument was cold and clumsy looking, that some of the statues here to Lincoln are not beautiful; the argument that when men want to pay tribute to one whom they love and who made for the good of their Republic they should do something that would be useful—that argument would tear down every temple; it would uproot every shrine; it would even pull the flag from the sky because it might be made more useful than by simply swishing there. [Applause.]

The Washington Monument, Mr. Speaker, is a great tribute to the father of our country. I remember that when I first came to this Capital City when but a boy the great patriotic lesson that was impressed upon my mind by the lofty monument to the memory of the father of the Republic, which was at once emblematic of the affection and pride of a grateful people. [Applause.] Monuments, memorials, and statues are not intended to be useful. They are erected to men who have been useful and who have served their country well. [Applause.] You want this roadway from here to Gettysburg. Why select the field of carnage to perpetuate the memory of the man who loved peace so well [applause]; the one who said at the Hampton Roads conference, "Write union at the top and anything else under it." He wanted to avoid the dread conflict, and I believe this House will not do its duty to the memory of this great Kentuckian, this great Illinoisian, this great American, this great patriot if you allow yourselves to be diverted from your solemn purpose to erect a memorial to him to start a public-road movement or trifle with it in any such way as that. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the man who erects a republic deserves a lasting place in the affections of men. But who is prepared to say that even the man who erects a republic is greater than the man who saves a republic? [Applause.] For those who have enjoyed the freedom and opportunity that liberty gives suffer more when it is taken from them than those who have never known of its glories. [Applause.]

Kentucky gave to the South Jefferson Davis, who stood at the head of a patriot army, which for courage and sincerity finds no counterpart in all the annals of war. [Applause.] Lincoln stood at the head of another patriot army, inspired by love of country. The war is over. Let us perpetuate the memory of Abraham Lincoln as befits his life and his deeds. But let me say here and now that, though some would trifle with it and use it as a public-roads propaganda, yet—

Till the future dares forget the past, his fate and fame shall be an echo and a light unto eternity.

[Long-continued applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I have agreed that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] may yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the memorial as proposed by the committee which has had the matter in charge. [Applause.] I naturally feel a hesitancy in differing with the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, who played such a conspicuous part as a Union soldier during the war between the States. I do not wish to play the hypocrite, nor profess to have that in me which is not there. I am the son of a Confederate soldier, and it is the proudest fact of my life that my father bore an honorable part in that great struggle for local self-government. Above my desk in the House Office Building hangs a picture of Jefferson Davis. At his feet when a boy I sat as at the feet of Gamaliel and learned the story of the Confederacy and the principles for which it stood. As a young man, when I stood at the altar with her who was to be the partner of my life, Jefferson Davis stood with us, and when the ceremony ended he placed his hands upon our heads and said, "God bless you, my children."

These are memories which I cherish, Mr. Speaker, and shall hand down a rich legacy to my children.

The great war ended 50 years ago, and, thank God, the thoughts of men have broadened with the process of the suns. In 1861 my father followed the Stars and Bars and wore the gray. In 1898 I followed the Stars and Stripes and wore the blue. [Applause.] I believe that I was right in 1898, and I as surely believe that he was right in 1861.

We are here to-day engaged in a high and lofty purpose. Abraham Lincoln needs no memorial. We can add nothing to his fame, nor can we subtract one jot or tittle from it. He and Jefferson Davis, Ulysses S. Grant, and Robert E. Lee must stand before the bar of history upon the record of their deeds done in the body, and each alike must abide its judgment. I have little respect for him on either side the line who fears that final verdict.

Those were bloody years, mad with strife and sad with the suffering and travail of a weeping people; but we should not forget them. We should rather teach our children to emulate the deeds of those who bore the brunt of battle and bowed beneath the awful burdens of State. I believe he reads his country's history with little understanding who can not catch an inspiration to patriotism from every battle field in this Republic. [Applause.] We have erected monuments throughout the North to the Union soldiers. We have erected monuments throughout the South to the Confederate soldiers; but the labor of love is not yet completed.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Quebec a few years ago and visited the Plains of Abraham. Two hundred years ago the British, under Wolfe, and the French, under Montcalm, fought on that battle field for the mastery of Canada. Upon it to-day there stands a monument erected by the descendants of those who fought under Wolfe and the descendants of those who fought under Montcalm. On it is inscribed this legend:

To Wolfe and Montcalm. Valor gave them a common death; history gave them a common fame; posterity gave them a common monument.

Speaking as far as I may speak for those whose hopes went out at Appomattox, I stand ready to vote for such a monument on every battle field of the Republic to commemorate the heroism of those who there gave up their precious lives, whether they wore the blue or whether they wore the gray. [Applause.]

I believe we are beginning such a monument here to-day, although this resolution provides for only half of it. The monument we are building is to Abraham Lincoln, the embodi-



ment of all for which the Union soldier fought and won. Across the river, as I believe, upon the sacred soil of old Virginia, in the near future another monument will arise to the memory of Jefferson Davis, who was the embodiment of all for which the Confederate soldier fought and lost. For such a monument I believe no price could be too high; for such a purpose I believe that no money can be ill spent.

I think it ought to be beautiful. I would not stain the even virtue of our enterprise by exchanging the inspiration of the artist for the sordid commercialism of the road builder. [Applause.]

I believe it ought to be beautiful, beautiful enough to be worthy the high commission we will give it, a commission to tell the ages yet to come how soon it was that happy day rolled around, foretold in the prophetic language of Lincoln, "When the mystic chords of memory stretching from every battle field and patriot's grave to every heart and hearthstone all over this broad land would again swell the chorus of the Union when touched, as they surely have been touched, by the better angels of our nature." [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I will read myself, as I think the Clerk will have difficulty in reading it:

In line 10 strike out the word "approve" and insert "disapprove, and that a memorial arch on Sixteenth Street at a suitable point north of the intersection of U Street and Sixteenth Street, at a cost not to exceed \$2,000,000, be erected instead of the building provided by the commission."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the amendment on the theory that it has been reported by the Clerk.

Mr. SIMS. I read it myself because I thought the Clerk might have difficulty in reading it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will rule that the Clerk read it.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, no one in this House has more reverence for the characteristic qualities of Abraham Lincoln that made him worthy of our memory than I have.

What were the characteristics of Abraham Lincoln? Do you wish the future to have an idea of what the man was? Shall whatever we erect here as a memorial to him be a reflection of the man, so that it may be educational as well as ornamental? How did he start in life, and where? The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], the eloquent Senator-to-be, told you he was born in Kentucky, in a log cabin. What next do we hear of Abraham Lincoln? That he was a rail splitter; and I have a kindly feeling for any man who ever split rails. The next thing we hear of him was his championship of human rights, regardless of the color of the human being. From this humble beginning in the log cabin he rose to the highest office in the land. What do all these things suggest to our minds? Born in a log cabin, being a rail splitter, then becoming the great champion of human rights. Will it be to those things that we will recur when we look upon an artistic heathen temple, however beautiful it may be, erected in a reclaimed frog pond? God made Abraham Lincoln, and let us place his memorial on a God-made hill, where the mosquitoes and the frogs will not bother and annoy those who come to look upon it. I have little patience with using that name to promote any other purpose than the purpose for which it ought to be used; that is, to bring back to us in vivid recollection the man and what he was to his country, what he was as a citizen, and what he was when he died. Does your heathen temple suggest Lincoln in any phase of his useful life?

We can not get away from the thought suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT], who charged, perhaps truthfully, that the road to Gettysburg would be used for purposes least suggestive of the life and character of Abraham Lincoln—show places, automobile races, and things of that sort. I am just as far from wanting to do things by indirection as any man in this House. I say if we are going to undertake to build public highways at national expense, let us go boldly about it, but I have as little patience with the location of this memorial in Potomac Park, in order that it may be used as an argument to build a magnificent automobile driveway from that park to Rock Creek Park, and on out to the Soldiers' Home, where it will be beyond the common use of a poor man, like Abraham Lincoln was in his early days, available only to the wealthy who can afford such things as automobiles and carriages. I do not mean to insinuate that the honorable committee that reported this bill or that the commission had any such thought and purpose, but this location is being contended for and promoted by some men who want it more as an excuse for building a great automobile driveway, than as a suitable and desirable place for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Speaker, I have looked all over Washington, and I find nowhere in this city a memorial arch or an arch of any kind.

The Washington Monument stands to the south of the White House. Here is a great avenue from the doors of the White House running north to the District boundary, one of the finest in this city. Along its course are many hills made by the Creator who made Lincoln, elevations higher by far than any proposed artificial mound to be erected in Potomac Park out of soil removed from other places and piled up in that mosquito-breeding swamp formerly known as the Potomac Flats. Why not place out on that great avenue on one of those splendid nature-built hills, a great monumental arch, as provided for in my amendment, not costing over \$2,000,000 so as to keep it within the appropriation? Then upon that great arch, from one end to the other, place the log cabin; place the rail splitter on the top of a rail cut with the ax in his hands; place him there laboring for the freedom of the slave; place him in a miniature White House as President of this great Nation—and then you will have an inspiring object lesson to the youth of this country.

You can point to the boy born in the log cabin who, on account of his belief in right doing, ended his days on earth in the White House. It will be memorializing this great man in a way everyone will approve. Then there is one further thing to commend this location. There is no real estate speculative scheme that can connect itself with this memorial arch on Sixteenth Street. Of course any improvement on any street of any kind affects values near by it, but that part of the District has already been exploited. The property has been all bought and sold so often that the speculative opportunities are about all gone. Within two squares of that magnificent avenue runs Fourteenth Street, with street car lines. What poor persons that Lincoln loved so well will see his monument, or how often will they see it if placed down in that reclaimed frog pond, or how many will go over the proposed driveway from it and through Rock Creek Park to the Soldiers' Home? No; the people whom Lincoln loved and served in his lifetime will rarely ever see it. It takes their entire time in this high-priced town to make enough to buy the necessities of life on which to live. With that great arch across that great avenue the poorest man, the poorest woman, the poorest boy in the city of Washington can go of his own accord, can go within two blocks by street cars and walk over and look at that magnificent memorial portraying to the youth of this country the possibilities of a great, free Republic. What will your Greek temple suggest to anybody that will be a benefit to the future generations of this country? Then there will not be any competition, as it were, between the Washington Monument and this proposed memorial arch as a monument to another great American citizen, erected on Sixteenth Street, in another and noncontiguous portion of the city.

By adopting my amendment we will have a memorial erected to Abraham Lincoln where the greatest opportunity will be afforded to people to see it, both those who live here and those who visit this Capital, both rich and poor.

Mr. Speaker, let us extend that memorial arch across this great avenue, and on it let there be placed such statues as may be necessary to bring to the lively remembrance of everyone who sees it those deeds in his life that made Abraham Lincoln what he was to this Nation. The arch can be as artistic as a Greek temple, and in purpose, design, and effect on the high land of Sixteenth Street it certainly will far exceed anything which can be placed down in Potomac Park. Besides, it will be no promoter's excuse to put off on the Government a lot of almost valueless real estate at high prices. The highway to Gettysburg could be used by the poor man, could be used by the wayfarer, could be used by the automobilists, could be used by the dray and the cart, but anybody who goes to this Potomac Park must use a carriage or automobile. There are no street cars approaching it, and you practically risk your life if you go down there afoot; if you are not a pretty good hand, pretty expert in the use of your legs, you will be in danger of your life. But instead of putting up anything in frog land, put it where everybody can see it who wants to, without the rich man's resources, without cost, where are the facilities of street car service, the cheapest form of transportation available to the poor, so that to them it will be an inspiration for all time to come, and in the erection of which no real estate scandal can possibly develop.

Let Lincoln's memorial be placed on the highest ground in the District, where the first ray of sun will wreath his brow in the morning and the last ray will light up that kindly face in the evening.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] and reserve the balance.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee yields 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] and reserves the balance of his time.

[Mr. SAUNDERS addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. PICKETT. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Speaker, this should be a memorial of peace and not of war. While I was first attracted somewhat by the scheme to build a road to Gettysburg, America's great Ansterlitz, upon further and more serious reflection I have concluded that that would be a mistake. I am disposed to look with a great deal of favor personally upon the idea suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP]. I think if Mr. Lincoln could speak to us to-day he would say that he would give the poor boys like himself an opportunity for at least a primary education. But I believe that as the question stands to-day none of these measures will be considered, probably, under the rules, and the question is, Shall we have a memorial after half a century, in which the life and memory and character of this great man have been sacredly cherished in the hearts of the American people? I think it has been wisely ordered that considerable time should elapse in which we might witness, as we have, the blending of the blue and the gray, and see men on both sides of this House unite in their earnest purpose to erect now, or as soon as possible, a suitable memorial to the western world's greatest patriot and greatest lover of mankind. [Applause.]

I say that this should be a memorial of peace and not of war. We should not be reminded so much of the physical and awful struggle between neighbors and brothers of half a century ago on that field as we should of that love which springs from the better impulse of our national life, which is at least latent in our national heart and which was personified in the life and character of Abraham Lincoln. This universal love of mankind, this paternal affection for mankind and his country enabled him to lead us out of the thick darkness of our national distress into the bright light of perpetual peace, I trust, and of lasting prosperity as a people. [Applause.] And I firmly believe that this man was so universal in his character that we may rejoice at this day to find a united country and a united House in their devotion to his memory. Have you ever noticed, as you have studied that immortal oration at Gettysburg, that he was a man too great to be affected even by the partisanship of war? So broad and parental was his love that his references on that field were to "the men who died here," "the men who sleep here." He did not even say then "the Union soldier," "the man in blue," or "the man in gray." It was a parental love, and he was large enough to see that under the infinite providence of God that terrible and mournful struggle was perhaps necessary in the evolution of our race and in the perpetuation of our institutions, and by reason of that broad, universal, and parental love he rose from that terrible night of conflict, at last holding aloft in mournful triumph the flag, not of a section, but of a nation, and the greatest Nation under God's blue sky. [Applause.]

I am for perpetuating the idea which dominated the great and masterful life of Abraham Lincoln. He knew in his great heart that love moves the world, that it is next to the heart of the Infinite. He came from the wilderness of the South. His heart in all that agony was as much with his neighbors of the South as his conscience was with the cause of human freedom contended for at the North.

For four long years, in agony and pain, he held one hand in the North and one in the South, and finally bound them together by his unselfish devotion to the cause of human liberty and an enduring Union. [Applause.]

It was not to celebrate a momentary victory or the heroism of the forces of one side in the conflict that he made that great speech. That speech was made that we might consecrate ourselves anew, as he said, to the cause of freedom and to the perpetuation of the Nation—a Nation dedicated to the principle that all men are equal. It was a prophecy of a new birth in freedom and a pledge that this new Nation that holds the hope of the world should not perish from the earth.

Mr. Speaker, let us build a beautiful memorial, not to the physical man, not to the battle field, not to perpetuate the memory of past antagonisms, but to symbolize that larger national love which Lincoln manifested to the world, without which all nations are but the passing pageant of an hour. [Applause.]

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with profit and pleasure to gentlemen who have spoken in the interest of good roads and to those who have favored a suitable memorial to Abraham Lincoln. I have gone upon record as a friend of good roads. I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and that committee reported during the last session a bill which carried an appropriation of more than \$14,000,000 for the improvement and construction of public highways in the United States. I contributed in my humble way, Mr. Speaker, toward the passage of that bill through this House. As gentlemen here will recall, that bill died in the Senate. I am an advocate of good roads, and if I live I propose to continue in the Sixty-third Congress to plead for Government aid for public-roads building in the United States; but I do not have to vote now for a road from Washington to Gettysburg in order to convince the country that I am a friend of the good-roads movement. [Applause.]

There is a time for all things, the Good Book tells us, and this is the time for the Representatives of the American people to speak for and vote for a memorial temple to be erected in the capital of this Nation to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.] What more appropriate place could be selected for the building of a monument to Abraham Lincoln than in the capital of the Nation? Here Representatives in Congress from the South and from the North discussed the great issues that were ultimately settled by the arbitrament of the sword. It was here that southern Representatives announced to the Nation the secession of their States, and from this capital went to cast their fortunes with their States on the field of war. Here Lincoln presided as President during that bloody conflict between the States. Here he received the good tidings that the war was over, and here that he rejoiced when the dove of peace brought an olive branch from Appomattox [applause], and here that his eyes glowed with the joyous vision of a reunited country. [Applause.] It was here that he said, "Let us all work together now to restore these States to their places in the great Union of States." [Applause.] Here, Mr. Speaker, that he breathed his last, to the great loss and deep sorrow of the South and the whole country. [Applause.]

Had he lived the South would never have known the horrors of reconstruction. [Applause.] The despised carpetbagger would never have been noted in the annals of southern history. [Applause.] The whole country suffered by his death, but the South suffered most. [Applause.] Had he lived the two sections, bravely fighting for what they believed to be right, would have been bound together sooner in the ties of everlasting love and union. [Applause.] Lincoln is the common heritage of our common country, and the South delights to honor his name. [Applause.] No section of our country takes more pride in this Capital of a reunited people than does the brave and chivalrous South. [Applause.] The war had to come. It took the war to settle the question of secession, and never until Lee surrendered to Grant at Appomattox and the names of these two brave generals passed into the Valhalla of American fame was the right to secede withdrawn from the States. [Applause.] Here Lincoln presided as President through that stormy period; here he breathed his last, and to this place the hearts of a sorrowing people turned at the sad news of his death; and here let us build a lasting monument to his memory. [Applause.]

No, Mr. Speaker, no automobile boulevard from Washington to Gettysburg will suffice to perpetuate the memory of Lincoln. [Applause.] Out yonder is Gettysburg, the scene of one of the bloodiest battles in human history. Monuments are erected there to the memory of those who fought on opposing sides. We have Gettysburg now, and we have a way to reach it, but, Mr. Speaker, we have no appropriate memorial in the city of Washington to the name of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.] Let us erect here in this beautiful Capital City a magnificent temple to his memory.

In a few moments the tourist can view the entire magnificent memorial temple and carry it back home photographed upon his memory, but if he desired to see a highway builded from Washington to Gettysburg he would have to travel 90 miles in order to have a complete view of the entire memorial. I shall cast my vote in favor of a memorial temple to be erected in the Capital of our country to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

Surrounded by poverty when a boy and with but little of the aid afforded by letters, he buffeted the waves of ill luck and ill fortune and rose superior to all opposing forces and achieved the highest office within the gift of a proud and patriotic people. [Applause.]



Mr. Speaker, in the years to come southern boys and northern boys, eastern boys and western boys, thrilled with patriotic emotions, will stand around this temple in solemn meditation and catch inspiration as they ponder the story of his eventful life. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. TALBOTT].

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, my home and my occupation for a part of the time that President Lincoln was a great factor in making history are a little embarrassing to me. If the plan of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] should obtain, the Lincoln highway would go through a part of my congressional district, and I think that is a part of the most beautiful land on earth. It would be a benefit to some of the very best people that ever breathed the breath of life. I have tried all I could to find out exactly what I ought to do in relation to this proposition. I do not think because I represent my own beautiful country that I should vote for this proposition of the highway unless it is right, and I have so stated. In the brief time allowed me I want to state that the construction of the highway is the only thing to do. If you could cross the Great Divide and say to Lincoln that we are determined to erect a memorial to him, befitting his public services and life and character, and ask him to make a selection, I am quite sure that he would say to construct the highway.

Mr. Speaker, what will the highway do? It is the connecting link between the field of the greatest battle ever fought and the National Capital, from which it was directed. It will be the road, strange to say, along which the Union veterans marched, and they had to interpose themselves between the grandest army—Gen. Lee's army—so far as bravery and fighting qualities are concerned, that the world ever saw, and this Capital.

It is not worth while to discuss the Battle of Gettysburg. It has been talked about and written about, and will be as long as the world stands. There is only one thing about it, I will say to my southern friends. We failed. The South failed at Gettysburg, and that is all there is to it—and there was the sunset of our ambition. Now, what in the world can be more appropriate than to construct a great highway from Washington to Gettysburg in memory of this great man. We are united, we are happy, we are a great Nation; and if we have done anything against each other for which we are sorry, we have forgiven each other.

Why not do the sensible thing and vote for this memorial from Washington to Gettysburg? We all have agreed that Abraham Lincoln was in public life, perhaps, the greatest humanitarian of his day. He was a plain character, a plain man, and I will repeat, if you could cross the Great Divide and reach him where he is and where he ought to be and say to him that we would like to do something to perpetuate the memory of his life and character and services for this land of ours, he would say at first, no; that he wanted nothing from any of us; that his life and character and services to his land were enough for him; but he would also say that if we had made up our minds to spend money, then that he wanted us to spend it in the way that would do the most good for the people of the country that he loved so well. That would be his message to us.

I have seen boats rowed around Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street because of floods from the Potomac River, and you have got, perhaps, to meet that emergency if you place the memorial there.

Why, Mr. Speaker, this is the Mecca for all the people who can afford to visit this beautiful city and who want to see what is going on. They come to Washington. Do you want them to go home and say, "Oh, I saw the Lincoln memorial down here on a place that was flooded"? The best report for the returned visitor to make of his impression of Washington is, "I have traveled the Lincoln highway to the greatest battle field of the war, where the greatest generals, where the bravest soldiers, fought each other; I traveled it, and there"—if he is a southern man he will say—"I saw where Pickett charged and broke the line." If he is a northern man he will say, "I saw where Hancock fell, I saw where Sickles fell," and so on down the line. If you want to do a great thing, my countrymen, on the floor of this House, and you want to do a popular thing, connect this Capital City with the greatest battle field in the history of warfare; spend your money in that way. "Oh," says my friend HEFLIN, of Alabama, "it is a boulevard for automobiles." The man who has an automobile is going to ride, anyhow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. I would like to have one minute additional.

Mr. BORLAND. I yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. I want to say that you can not do a more fitting or a more glorious thing than to construct a road from the great Capital of the Nation to the great battle field of the Nation.

I thank you all, Mr. Speaker, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment there can be but two good reasons given for the appropriating of public money for the construction of a monument or memorial to any individual.

One is that the character of and the services rendered by the individual were so exalted and beneficial to the people that the Representatives of the people are justified in appropriating public money for the construction of a monument or memorial commemorating the life and services of the individual.

The other reason—and which, in my opinion, is the stronger—is that such monument or memorial will tend to aid in the education and the enlightenment of the people.

I am opposed to the construction of a highway from Washington to Gettysburg in this instance, for, in my judgment, it would fail to serve, either as a monument to Abraham Lincoln or tend to aid in the education of our people.

Such a road truly would serve a certain purpose. It would make a nice driveway for those who can afford to enjoy themselves by traveling over the country in automobiles. But so far as being a memorial to Abraham Lincoln it would be a complete failure; for there would not be anything along this highway that would be suggestive of the life and services of Abraham Lincoln, save and except here and there an old Virginia rail fence, which might call to the mind of one familiar with the life of Mr. Lincoln that he once split rails in Illinois, and even this suggestion would be destroyed by the commercial advertising on the board fences and sign boards along the way, such as "Smoke Bull Durham," "Drink refreshing and invigorating Budweiser beer," and so forth, which would become matters of comment by the joy riders as they sped along this highway, which alone to the historian and the automobile driver for profit would be known and recognized as the Lincoln memorial highway.

Mr. Speaker, to advocate such a proposition is, to my mind, treating the name of Abraham Lincoln irreverently.

Is this what the American people want done in honor of Abraham Lincoln? Surely not. For, Mr. Speaker, if there is any American for whom a monument should be erected, solely as a matter of love and respect to his memory, that man is Abraham Lincoln, for his life and achievements furnish us the most striking illustration of the possibilities of American citizenship. He demonstrated that in this land of ours, without wealth or social position, it is possible for an American boy with energy and a good heart to win the highest honor within the gift of our people.

Washington, Jefferson, and many others have added brilliant pages to our history, and we love and revere their memory; but they were the children of fortune and social position, while Lincoln was the child of poverty and acquainted with adversity. Surely it is an inspiration to think of the life of this great man; to follow him in his career from his cabin home in old Kentucky, thence as a boy, with his pioneer father, to the wilderness of Indiana; thence to Illinois, from which State he came to this city as the Chief Executive of our Nation; and here for four long years, with sorrowful heart but with fixed purpose, he held aloft above the dark clouds of civil conflict the flag of our Union. And when the dove of peace had once more returned to our stricken country and the great armies that had battled for supremacy were about to disband and return to their homes in the North and the Southland, to become citizens once more of a peaceful and united country, Lincoln, who had borne the greatest burden of it all, was stricken down by the assassin and died without a word. The obscurity of his birth, the hardship and sorrow of his life, and his tragic and untimely death combine to form the most pathetic tragedy this world has witnessed since our Savior staggered and fell beneath his cross at Calvary.

Construct a road as a memorial to this man. Oh, no. Connect his name with Gettysburg, once the scene of bloodshed and carnage. No. For the mention of Gettysburg recalls one of the saddest incidents in our history. Lincoln, the great lover of peace, whose soul shuddered at the thought of war, should not be connected by memorial with any battlefield, but here in this city, the capital of the Nation, where he suffered and



died, should be constructed a magnificent monument which should stand alone, distinct, sublime, and which should be a tribute of love from the American people.

It is true it will cost something; it can not be used by anyone, and it should not; but it should simply stand as a monument to his life and services, and it should be of such imposing character that the thousands of students who visit this city annually, as they stand and gaze upon it in all its simple grandeur, will go away impressed with the thought that it portrays the strength and beauty of the character of Abraham Lincoln. I have but little patience with those who argue that Lincoln was a plain and unostentatious man and that this is a waste of money and that it had better be expended in a way that will be for the pleasure and convenience of at least a part of our people. Those who make the argument fail to conceive the real purpose of this monument. This monument, in my judgment, as I said before, should be erected simply as a memorial to this great man and for no other purpose. There are always present those who object to the expense or waste. We are told that when Martha brought the precious ointment to anoint her Master some complained and said that it should be sold and the money given to the poor. But that was Martha's tribute of love. So this monument to Abraham Lincoln should represent the tribute of love of his countrymen.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, as a citizen of Illinois and one who reveres the memory of Abraham Lincoln, and one who has oftentimes stood at his tomb at Springfield, Ill., where his ashes rest in peace, in the name of the citizenship of that great Commonwealth that stood loyally by Lincoln in the hours of his greatest trial, I beg of you to stamp with your disapproval any proposition that tends to connect the name of this great man with any utilitarian purpose under the guise of constructing something to his honor.

Far better leave him alone in his glory. His fame is secure. No act of ours can add to the glory of his splendid career. No monument of granite or bronze is needed to perpetuate the story of his life and achievements through the coming centuries. As long as men love liberty and believe in the equality of man the name of Abraham Lincoln will shine with steady and increasing luster, and the erection of the proposed monument on the bank of the Potomac is not for the purpose of perpetuating his name, but simply to show our love and appreciation of his life and services.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it will be admitted by everyone that in case a majority vote was required to determine any architectural design in the world, where there are a number of competing plans, it would be impossible to secure a majority, and that consequently nothing would be done. The history of competitions in architectural memorials prove this to be true. The Washington Monument for half a century after it had been started remained incomplete. Half a century has elapsed since the death of Lincoln, and we have done nothing. There are many suitable forms which a memorial may take, and they appeal differently to many different minds, and there is only one way in which we can ever erect a memorial of any kind, and that is for some men to yield to the taste of others. The present situation shows the truth of the old saying, "*de gustibus non disputandum*." So one may think a bridge is the fittest monument; another an arch, another a pyramid, another an obelisk. Then there are all sorts and descriptions of statues which may better please the taste of others. We have come to a period in the history of a Lincoln memorial when it is time to act. We have chosen a Fine Arts Commission to advise us, and that commission is unanimous. The Congress of the United States has appointed a commission consisting of the President of the United States, the Speaker of this House, and distinguished Senators and Congressmen, and they have presented a unanimous report. Under these circumstances I for one feel that it is necessary to subordinate my own desire or my own project or my own taste to the taste of what is evidently the majority of those best qualified to pass on such a question. Two years ago, when this question first came before the Library Committee, I was opposed to this design. Two years' careful study of the entire subject, and after having had hearings before the Library Committee upon this subject, makes me perfectly clear on this proposition: That the majority of the people of the United States who have made a special study of artistic matters are satisfied with the memorial proposed by the Fine Arts Commission. The proposal comes within the amount authorized for the memorial. The cost of the Bacon design is \$1,750,000, which will leave an ample margin for the preparation of the grounds and the planting suitable to the design.

Captious criticism is passed on every artistic design, and it seems to be impossible to avoid it. The greatest works of art have been subject at times to ridicule. I call the attention of

the House to what happened in regard to the Washington Monument, and what I shall say of that monument I say on the assumption that there is not a man in this House who does not appreciate the lesson that that monument teaches. As a great judge of art has said:

It is gray in the dawn, brilliant in the sunlight, black in the thunderstorm, pink in the afterglow, mysterious in the moonlight, vanishing in the mist, lost in the clouds—always majestic stands the memorial to the Father of his Country. In the sunlight and shadow, thunderstorm and mist, in the clouds and in the clear sky, against the golden sunrise and the red sunset, against the midday sky of blue and the midnight sky scintillating with stars, against the bright white clouds and the dark gray clouds, moving with the wind, bowing to the warmth of the sun, receiving the lightning's stroke, ever changing, it is always stately, always beautiful.

Yet adverse criticism was common years ago. In the North American Review of March, 1816, in discussing what was necessary for a design for the Monument, an author demanded a statue by capable American artists and derided the imitation of ancient models, and the author says:

If an architectural monument is resolved upon, the principal forms are the pyramid, the obelisk, the triumphal arch, and the columns. The two former were peculiar to the Egyptians and may be considered beyond the power of any modern nation.

In 1879, in an article in the American Architect, we find this sentence in regard to the Washington Monument:

The ugliest monument in the world is in a fair way to be completed. In the same journal of December 13, 1884, we find these words:

There is some satisfaction in reflecting that the United States possesses the tallest building in the world, but when this is said there will be little else about the Monument of which we can be proud.

W. W. Story, himself a noted sculptor, in protesting against the obelisk, said:

This form of architecture is the refuge of incompetency. In architecture when an architect is incompetent he resorts to the obelisk.

An article in the Atlantic Monthly of April, 1879, referred to the "puerile character of the design" and to "clinging to an obsolete idea."

The debates in the House of Representatives on the final appropriations for the Washington Monument are likewise instructive. On August 2, 1876, a joint commission, as in the present case, was created by Congress, and that commission reported unanimously in favor of completing the obelisk on the site on which it was begun. On April 2, 1878, there was an interesting debate upon the floor of this House as to the location of the Monument. It was said to be in a swamp; that is worse than saying it is down "by the brewery." A gentleman from Michigan wanted the Monument placed upon solid ground at the soldiers' home. The brilliant Cox, of New York, known as Sunset Cox, said:

One thing is very sure, and that is, that if that Monument is ever finished it will be as unsightly as it is to-day; it is not the kind of a monument we should erect in this city in the memory of George Washington.

Mr. Clymer, of Pennsylvania, said:

It is a meaningless shaft. There is nothing in the past like it.

A Congressman from Maryland moved that the Monument be transferred to Baltimore. It would be useless to further quote from that debate. We have heard it all over again this afternoon; the same differences of tastes, the same wildness and crudity of statement, the same inappreciation of the beautiful in art, and the same appeal to the great unwashed.

Now, one word as to the practical value of this Monument. A monument in its very nature has no material value, and ought not to have. It ceases to be a monument when the latter is its predominating characteristic. For that very reason anything that is used every day can never be a memorial in the sense in which our race has raised memorials to its dead in all the past ages. A memorial which speaks of a man should bring to men the lesson of his life at a glance. It should not be something that will enable us to put money in our pockets or to save money.

A memorial is not an economic proposition—it is the payment of a debt of gratitude; it is a recognition of the example of greatness; it is a lesson to the youth of the land. To turn such an object to profit is prostitution, if not sacrilege. But our opponents especially love to dwell on the phrase "Greek temple," and to speak of Lincoln within that temple as a "Greek god," and some of them ask for American architecture as though there were such a thing. If the Greek temple is inappropriate for Lincoln, because it is Greek, then the Capitol in which we stand is inappropriate for us because its dome is Roman. If the argument for the road is good, let us tear down the Capitol building and build an up-to-date Chicago or New York skyscraper of 20 stories. The great styles of buildings were all discovered before America was discovered, and we to-day must and do adopt these styles to our changing needs,



and that is the purpose of great architecture. You might just as well object to the use of marble for sculpture because the Greeks used it, and ask why haven't we got some American metal or material out of which sculptures can be made. You might just as well object to pictures being painted in oil or water colors and ask why haven't we got some American material out of which pictures can be made. It is said by some that there is no connection between this magnificent monument and the character of Abraham Lincoln. Such a person must have a very singular concept of art. Of all the forms of architecture in existence the simplest, the plainest, and the most magnificent is the Grecian. All of these qualities should recall Abraham Lincoln. The acme of Greek art is the Parthenon at Athens—the acme of the art of the people who developed the idea of federal power. It was Greek political and statesmanlike genius which welded together the idea of local sovereignty with a State that should be a unit to the rest of the world. The fundamental idea in the American Constitution is unity to the outside world but diversity of local powers among the States. Jefferson pointed out the analogy. Our Government is founded upon a Greek concept of statesmanship. To no other Nation could we look so well for forms that symbolize liberty and majesty and simplicity as to Greek architecture. And what three adjectives so suit Abraham Lincoln—liberty, majesty, and simplicity.

Certainly as grand a sight as the eyes of men can rest upon meets the traveler as he sails up the Aegean and enters the Piræus and beholds the Acropolis crowned by a Greek temple. For over a thousand years that view has been the admiration of the Nations of the earth. It has done more to teach mankind the lesson of Greek civilization than any other scene in the world; it has done more to keep green the memory of Greek life than Marathon or Leuctra, or any road that the Greek may have built or than anything else that the Greeks ever did.

And it is now proposed here in Washington that we should erect a memorial to Abraham Lincoln as majestic, as simple, and as breathing the spirit of liberty which shall call the attention of succeeding ages to the second great period in our national existence and form a real and personal memorial of one of our two greatest national heroes.

Finally, there is but one question for us to-day. Shall we erect a monument to Abraham Lincoln or shall we not? It is preposterous to talk of a road in memory of Lincoln, because no road could be in memory of Lincoln. The men who talk about the Appian Way know nothing of Appian Claudius, but these selfsame men, when they behold Trajan's Column, or the arch of Septimius Severus or the arch of Constantine, are forced to remember these Roman emperors personally, and the reason is that these monuments are personal memorials and a road is a convenience. But the project is impracticable for other reasons. It will cost at least \$20,000,000 to build a really distinctive road from Washington to Gettysburg, and such a road would have to be protected for hundreds of feet on both sides to prevent road houses and other places of objectionable amusement from abutting upon it and becoming its principal feature, and finally such a road could be used only by those who could afford automobiles or carriages. If a trolley line was placed upon it so that the plain people could use it, it would be valuable and useful and, perhaps, something that we ought to do, but it would not be a memorial of Abraham Lincoln. It would not be a work of art, it would be a problem of transportation. The Washington Monument cost \$1,250,000; it would cost to-day probably \$2,000,000. The talk of building an adequate monument in Washington and adding a road to it is simply to add an additional cost to the \$2,000,000 already authorized, and it would in no wise add to the memory or glory of Abraham Lincoln. It might sell more rubber tires; it might be a benefit to the automobile interest; it might help the real estate interests; and I am saying none of these things with invidious meaning; it might do all of these things, but it would not perpetuate the memory of Abraham Lincoln. The question therefore is narrowed to this, Shall we set aside the unanimous finding of the Fine Arts Commission; shall we set aside the unanimous report of the Lincoln Memorial Commission, appointed under resolutions of the Senate and House of Representatives; shall we set aside the unanimous report of your committee and the bill which has passed the Senate? Shall we begin another 50 years of contest between artists over various forms of memorials, or shall we settle the matter by accepting the best authority that we have and in a few years place at the end of the Mall a monument unsurpassed in the art of the world, a monument in majesty and beauty of surrounding surpassing the Deutsches Eck, where the Moselle flows into the Rhine, the Arc de Triump in Paris, or the Garibaldi Memorial in Italy, and I believe the most magnificent testimony which the art of the world has ever raised in memory of any great man.

The monument to Lincoln, whatever its form, should be superlative of its kind.

John Hay said—I wish I could give his exact words—to a member of the Arts Commission: "The monument to Lincoln should not be in the rush of life, but a thing apart to which the American people would go for silent contemplation of the great qualities and character to which that monument is raised."

Gentlemen, we do not want the sensation of the joy rider connected with the thought of Lincoln in the minds of our American youth, but rather the catching of the breath in reverent awe, as when one enters the majestic silence of a great cathedral, where, within beautified silence, one may contemplate the qualities of heart and mind which go to make a great American.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, while I would like to see a memorial road running from Washington to Gettysburg, and would even extend that road, as a national peace memorial, from Washington to Richmond, I intend to vote for the Lincoln memorial as recommended by the Committee on Library. Desirable as the Washington-Gettysburg road would be, it is evident that to substitute it now for the beautiful and stately structure proposed to be erected on the Mall in the Capital City would indefinitely postpone the memorial which the people have it in their hearts to erect to Lincoln.

Moreover, the defeat of the memorial plan as proposed by the Fine Arts Commission would start an unseemly controversy that would not do credit to our intelligence as Representatives of the people.

As a Pennsylvanian I would like to see a road to Gettysburg. If it is to be a memorial road, Congress could erect it without necessarily committing itself to a general good-roads construction propaganda. It could extend that memorial road to Richmond likewise without binding itself to assume the cost of goods roads in the various States or such roads as may be interstate, but is this the time to inject the good roads or even the memorial road proposition?

We have before us a resolution providing "Approving the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln memorial." The resolution contemplates the expenditure of \$2,000,000 on a definite plan, a plan which involves the erection on the banks of the Potomac of a monumental structure close by the scenes of Lincoln's greatest activities and immediately across the way from Arlington, the former home of Gen. Lee. It is to be a fitting memorial upon hallowed ground in the official heart of the Nation.

In supporting the memorial as proposed, I am not opposing a memorial road to Gettysburg. I am supporting the proposition that is fairly and appropriately before the House. I want a great national memorial to the immortal Lincoln. The memorial road should not now be permitted to interfere with that worthy and patriotic project. Let us have the memorial first. The road project can be considered later.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, my contribution to this debate is not an original expression of opinion, but a remarkable newspaper editorial that was printed in the Sunday Globe, of Boston, Mass., on the anniversary of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, February 12, 1911.

The editorial is signed "Dudley," the nom de plume of Mr. James Morgan, who has contributed essays of real literary value that ought to be remembered long after the things usually printed in a daily newspaper are forever forgotten.

The title of the editorial is "Two boys." It follows:

The birth of a baby boy was hailed as the greatest event of the year 1811. His first little wail was heard round a waiting and listening world on a March morning 100 years ago.

All Paris had stopped and pricked up its ears to catch the news. The vast palace of the Tuilleries was filled with eager watchers. For 24 painful hours the expectant mother labored and her agonized cries rang through the great halls. The father, hero of mighty battles, fled in terror from the chamber of suffering. At last the child was safely delivered.

Cannon boomed the joyous news from their iron throats. The immense crowds in the streets counted the reports—20, 21. Was that all? Then it must be a girl. But hark! There sounded the twenty-second. It was a boy. Whereat thousands screamed their delight, till the roar of the cannon was almost drowned as they belched forth the rest of their 101 salutes for the baby. A balloonist sailed away from the rejoicing city to scatter printed bulletins of the wonderful occurrence throughout the country.

#### A KING IN THE CRADLE.

While Paris held carnival with gay processions by day and brilliant fireworks by night, messengers sped on relays of horses to bear the great news to distant capitals.

All the nations of Europe had been drawn together in mutual suspense. To some the boy was a herald of peace, while to others, the foes of his father's ambition, his advent carried discouragement or consternation. None remained indifferent to an event seemingly so momentous to mankind.

Courtiers fawned and poets rhapsodized. The mother forgot her long torture in the pride of her belief that she had borne a successor to the



master of the world. The father's cheeks were wet with tears of joy as he stood beside the cradle of gold and gazed at the tiny hand that still would make kings tremble when he was gone and that would pass on to posterity the scepter he had won. Now he could entell Europe and humanity. France should be the baby's patrimony and all the earth his hegemony.

He must have at once the proudest crown that ever weighted an infant head. Whereupon Napoleon hailed his babe King of Rome and carried him through the arch of triumph to Notre Dame, where, with great pomp, he christened him for himself and for the boy's imperial Austrian grandfather Napoleon Francis Joseph Charles.

#### THE OTHER BOY.

While Napoleon had the only baby king in the world, there were several million other baby boys 100 years ago. One of them was 2 years old and a little more when Napoleon Francis Joseph Charles thrilled Europe with his birth cry. No notice had been taken of the existence of this child, however, beyond a mile or two of his birthplace. His birth did not receive even the honor of a line in any record that has been discovered. No physician was summoned to aid the mother in her labors, and the father could not record the event, since he hardly knew how to write his own name.

No neighbor took enough interest in it ever to be able in after years to recollect the coming of this boy into the world. It boded no more than another hungry mouth with which to share the crust of poverty. His eyes opened not on palace walls, but on the rough logs of a hut in the Kentucky wilderness. No crib of gold awaited him; his only cradle was his mother's arms. His sole crown was some chance rag that could be fashioned into the semblance of a cap.

Nature, however, that incorrigible democrat, had given him just as many fingers as the King of Rome wherewith to grasp anything they could lay hold of, from a rattle to a scepter.

#### L'AILLON.

Pitiful as the contrast is between the births of those two boys, the contrast between their destinies is more pitiful still. Indeed, it is almost unkind to draw it.

The poor little King of Rome at 3 saw his crown dashed to pieces like a fragile toy. Marie Louise, his mother, fled with him to a cold welcome at her father's court in Vienna. His own father became to him a nameless outcast, and tutors puzzled how they might bring him up in ignorance of the empire and the glory to which he had been dedicated during his infancy. An alien name—the Duke of Reichstadt—and as he reached the years when under other fortunes he would have taken his place in the grand army as prince imperial his keepers strove to make him proud to put on the uniform of an Austrian sergeant.

The fledgling of the eagle never showed a desire to escape from his gilded cage, and although he died at 21 he lived long enough for the world to forget him.

#### THE HANDICAP OF ADVANTAGES.

If the world could have had eyes to see the start of the race between those two boys for fame and power 100 years ago, it would have had only a smile of pity for the son of Thomas Lincoln; its confidence and cheers would have been, as they were, all for the son of Napoleon.

Yet it was by no strange trick of fortune that Abraham Lincoln won the race. Leave out of the reckoning the early death of the King of Rome, leave out his father's downfall, leave this boy out entirely, and take any one of a hundred or a thousand heirs to great hopes who were born 100 years ago and match him against Lincoln. Lincoln beat all the kinglets and princelings as he beat the King of Rome. They were endowed with no more fingers and no more toes than he had. Every fancied advantage which was fondly conferred on them only loaded them down.

#### HOW TO MAKE A KING.

Napoleon himself started at nothing and whipped the heir of all ages. Yet he forgot that he could not transmit to his son the superiority that had lifted him above the sons of conquerors. As well might an athletic champion flatter himself that he could bequeath his championship.

If Napoleon was determined to raise up another Napoleon, he might have tried to rear his boy as he was reared rather than like a Bourbon. His father and mother were hunted things in the Corsican mountains until within a few weeks of his birth, when, the war being over, they returned to Ajaccio, weary and poverty stricken, but just in time for him to be born under a roof. His childhood was as free as a savage's and nearly as wild. The sailors on the beach and the herdsmen in the mountains were his favorite companions and principal instructors.

#### LEARNING TO RULE.

The most practical and useful monarch Europe ever had was Peter the Great. He stepped down from the throne of the Czars and went to work in disguise that he might learn how to rule.

He stepped down from the throne of the Czars and shunned princes and palaces. Laboring and living among the working people of Holland, England, and other foreign countries, he made docks and shipyards and machine shops his university. Equipped with lessons from real life, he went back to his throne and erected Russia into a nation, adding half a dozen provinces to his empire, pushing its frontier to the shores of two seas, set up a modern army and fleet, and established academies, galleries, and libraries.

Liberty is the only school for greatness, and privation and toil the only teachers. The prevalent stupidity of royalty and aristocracy is far less surprising than the genius it develops in rare instances under overwhelming disadvantages.

#### LINCOLN'S APPRENTICESHIP.

In the race for all the greatest prizes of life there is a good deal of fairness and equality. There is a pretty even start for the enduring honors in statecraft and war, in letters, in science, and in whatever field men contend for the noblest rewards. Fame really means to be democratic, and there is no royal road to her temple.

It is open to doubt if any king ever had as many advantages as Abraham Lincoln or was so well trained for ruling or leading a people. We hear much of his disadvantages, and many view his triumph over them as in the nature of a miracle. Looked at in another light, however, it is plainly to be seen that Lincoln was far more wisely apprenticed than any prince to the trade of governing. Thus when his great task came to him it found him trained like a thorough journeyman to lead the masses whose life he shared.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, coming from Pennsylvania I trust I am not ungracious in rising to say a word in favor of this con-

current resolution. I am reminded to-day of the scriptural injunction:

Is not the life more than meat and the body than raiment.

On the one side is the utilitarian idea, a road to Gettysburg; on the other is the esthetic, the beautiful—the appeal to memory, to gratitude, to veneration, to pay a tribute and show our appreciation of the greatness of Abraham Lincoln.

I am not opposed to the Gettysburg road. It is a splendid project. I hope it can be worked out in the future, either as a Lincoln memorial or as a direct proposal to build a national highway from the Capital to one of the greatest battle fields of the world; but I am first in favor of an appropriate mausoleum in the city of Washington.

From the earliest days it has been our policy to erect in the National Capital suitable memorials to the men whom the people delight to honor. Washington, Marshall, Lafayette, Jackson, Scott, Webster, the French and Polish patriots in the Revolution, Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, and the other great names that stand out in history because of their deeds in the Civil War. All these have been honored, but alas, nothing yet for the greatest of them all, Abraham Lincoln. Thirty-four years ago a Lincoln Memorial Association was formed and money raised, but nothing came of the movement. Now a conclusion has been reached so that the matter is presented to us in a distinct, clear, concrete form.

Who goes to Paris without a pilgrimage to the Hotel Des Invalides and with a melancholy pleasure immerses himself in the atmosphere which pervades the tomb of the great Napoleon?

What American or what lover of his race will in the coming years ever visit Washington without having first in his heart a desire to bow at the shrine of Abraham Lincoln, to read his immortal words on the proposed entablature, and thereafter highly resolve that the sacrifices of his day and generation for the uplift of the human race shall not have been in vain?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I gather from the debate that there is practical unanimity among the Members of this House in the belief that the time has now come when there ought to be a memorial of some kind erected or constructed by the American people to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. There is a division of opinion as to whether that memorial should be a utilitarian or a sentimental one. Personally I prefer the sentimental memorial. I have come to my conclusion after having torn a few leaves from the history of the past. I recall that in the city of Rome, near the ancient Forum, there stands the Arch of Titus. It is somewhat scarred and weather-beaten, for it has braved the elements since the first century of the Christian era. The buildings that surround it have crumbled into dust, but it still stands—a mute reminder of the eventful history of the Emperor Titus—he who with Vespasian built the Coliseum, which stands nearby; the marble facings and the bronze ornaments that decorated that wonderful arena have all disappeared. The shouts of triumph or dismay, as the occasion warranted, that reverberated throughout its spacious interior have faded into silence. The lizard and the bat are its sole inhabitants. It is a magnificent ruin and few even recall in whose reign it was constructed. Close by the Arch of Titus is the Arch of Constantine. It, too, is in a fair state of preservation. It stands alone near the ruins of what was once the glory of imperial Rome, the Forum. It was constructed in the early part of the fourth century. The barbarians who captured and destroyed the proud mistress of the world, imperial Rome, allowed it to remain—a mute reminder of the life of one of the foremost of the Roman Emperors. The Column of Trajan, erected in the closing years of the first century and the Column of Hadrian, erected during the same period, still rear their lofty tops toward the blue of heaven, while the buildings that surrounded them at the time of their construction have almost entirely disappeared from the ken of man. If it were not for these few memorials of pure sentiment that have withstood the ravages of time, the four Emperors whose lives and memories they commemorate would probably have been forgotten, even as the lives and memories of so many of the Emperors of Rome have become obliterated.

Some of the Members of this House seem to favor a great road to connect our Capital with the battlefield at Gettysburg. In advocacy of their plan they point to the Appian Way and contend that that road conferred immortality upon its builder. But they do not tell the Members of this House that the Appian Way was built entirely by slave labor; they do not tell the Members of the House that during the Dark Ages, when the barbarians of northern Europe ravaged the Campagna and broke through the walls of the Eternal City itself, they destroyed the famous thoroughfare. It was buried among the ruins of the tombs and mausoleums that lined it on either side. During the Middle Ages the Appian Way was almost entirely lost to the



sight of man. It remained buried until the year 1850, when Pope Pius IX ordered Canina, one of the leading archeologists of his period, to excavate the ruins and the debris that covered it, and restore it for the benefit of the Italian people. Although the road originally ran to Capua and thence to Brundisium, the modern city of Brindisi, a distance of several hundred miles, the restoration of Canina proceeded only 6 or 8 miles beyond the tomb of Caecilia Metella, one of the few ruins that faced the ancient roadway at the dawn of the renaissance. I understand that even to-day it is not a highway beyond its tenth mile.

While no one can look into the future, and while we all hope that this Republic may endure forever, it is not outside of the range of possibility that any road that might be built between Washington and Gettysburg may some day meet the fate of the Appian Way.

We have had one experience in road building in this country. The Cumberland Road, known as "the great National Pike," was begun in 1806 and finished in 1840. How many of our countrymen know anything about it in this day and generation? And yet it was the subject of debate upon this floor time and again during that period. With the advent of the railroads it fell into disuse. For 16 years after its completion it was controlled by the Federal Government, but in 1856 it was relegated to the various States through which it passed. It is to-day little more than a memory.

To refer to one or two other monuments that commemorate the lives of those in whose honor they were erected, I need simply mention the Pyramid of Cheops, which has withstood the decay of time and the attacks of the elements for about 4,000 years. The villages and the towns that surrounded it have been effaced from the face of the earth. Even the splendid civilization of the Egyptians is to-day largely a matter of conjecture, but that wonderful pile stands in all its majesty and grandeur to remind those of our era that once upon a time there existed in Egypt, in the very heyday of the civilization of that historic land, a monarch by the name of Cheops or Khufu. At Kamakura, in Japan, stands a massive bronze monument of the Buddha, or Gautama, who lived in India 2,500 years ago. It has stood for generations. It has come down to us practically intact and unimpaired. And so I might go on recalling memorials of sentiment that have been erected to commemorate the world's heroes, and that still endure, while the utilitarian institutions which surrounded them have crumbled into shapeless ruins.

I believe that the so-called Greek temple in Potomac Park would stand for centuries as an inspiration to the youth of our land. When the generations yet unborn will behold it they will recall the fact that the martyred President sprang from the loins of an humble farmer and frontiersman; that he rose to the highest office within the gift of a mighty and free people; that he illustrates the wonderful possibilities of American citizenship; that he preserved the American Union; that his clear judgment and patriotic purposes brought order out of chaos; and that a grateful and reunited country, desiring to honor his memory, has erected this magnificent memorial to Abraham Lincoln in token of the love, the gratitude, and the veneration with which its citizens regard one of the greatest of all mankind.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the same privilege.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen may extend their remarks in the Record within five legislative days upon this bill now pending.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen may extend their remarks for five legislative days upon this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does that include those who have not spoken?

The SPEAKER. It includes every Member in the House.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is now nearly half a century since the Civil War closed and Abraham Lincoln passed beyond. There has been a lapse of time which ought to permit us to survey the situation with little bias and little passion. I have put the Civil War behind me, a great conflict which was probably inevitable. There were patriots on both sides, gallant men in opposition, but the question of the Union was settled with the end of the war, and no one now would reopen the controverted question so bitterly contested before and during that war. I think we can well afford to do that which shows

that the country is again a reunited country, with the passions of war passed by, if not forgotten. I would erect a memorial to Abraham Lincoln on the farther side of the Washington Monument, just this side of the Potomac River, across the river from the home of Robert E. Lee and the burial place of both Union and Confederate soldiers, and then I would erect a memorial bridge across that Potomac River, joining the then Confederate States with the Union, aye, Mr. Speaker, joining the memory of Abraham Lincoln with the memories and respect for Lee. Aye, Mr. Speaker, I would go further. In the course of years not far distant I would construct a roadway from Washington to Mount Vernon, from Mount Vernon to Richmond, and at the other end of that roadway have the Government of the United States construct a memorial to Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederate States. [Applause.]

When we have done that we have shown to the world that the hearts of all Americans beat in the present as in the past with respect and love for their leaders on both sides. We can afford to forget the animosities and the passions in the peace that passeth all understanding. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendments which have been offered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. This resolution is a resolution providing:

That the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln memorial, determined upon and recommended to Congress December 4, 1912, by the commission created by the act—

Referred to in the resolution—

be, and the same are hereby, approved.

The act referred to in the resolution is an act approved February 9, 1911, which the Speaker will find in Thirty-sixth Statutes at Large, page 898. That was passed in the last Congress. That act provides that the gentlemen named in the act are created a commission to secure and determine upon a location, plan, and design for a monument or memorial in the city of Washington, D. C., to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, subject to the approval of Congress. Section 3 of the act provides—

That the construction of the monument or memorial herein and hereby authorized shall be upon such site as shall be determined by the commission herein created and approved by Congress.

The resolution pending before the House is simply a resolution to approve the location, the plan, and the design on the report of the commission which has been submitted to Congress in conformity with the act. It is not a resolution to amend the original act; it does not propose to amend the original act at all, but it is simply a resolution in accordance with the provisions of the original act to approve the plans which have been submitted by the commission.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. This is a joint resolution which has been passed and approved and has the force and effect of law?

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then does the gentleman not agree that we can repeal this entire law or this joint resolution or amend it in any way?

Mr. MANN. I am arguing now that you can not.

Mr. BARTLETT. Can not amend it or repeal it?

Mr. MANN. It is perfectly patent under the proposition that to repeal it is not germane to the resolution.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does not the gentleman from Illinois contend that this act could not be amended or repealed?

Mr. MANN. Certainly not. It would be in order to repeal or to pass an act or bill repealing the original act or amending the original act, but that is not the resolution pending before the House. It is not proposed by the resolution to affect the original act at all. There is not to be a line of the original act changed by this resolution. This resolution is in accordance with the existing provisions of the original act, providing for the approval by Congress of the plans recommended by the commission.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. We could approve these plans as well by an act as we could by a joint resolution?

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BARTLETT. There is no difference in an act or a joint resolution?

Mr. MANN. Not the slightest, in my opinion.

Mr. BARTLETT. And whatever you could do on a bill pending for this purpose you could do on a joint resolution?

Mr. MANN. I think so.

Now, the Speaker recently held that where a bill was pending to amend a section of the judiciary title, I believe, it was not in order to amend another section of that title, nor in order, by way of amendment, to introduce any new subject

matter not contemplated in the bill itself, because not germane to the provisions of the bill.

And even if in this case there were a bill pending to change the name of one of the commissioners I do not think it would be in order, as germane to that bill, to amend the other provisions of the act. But the joint resolution pending now is not a resolution to amend the original act at all. It is a resolution to carry into effect the provisions of the act as they stand in the law, providing that Congress shall approve these plans before the construction commences.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard in opposition to the point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the view taken by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] would so narrow the issue and so narrow the power of Congress in this respect that there would be nothing left for Congress to do under any form of resolution that could be introduced but to approve or disapprove the specific design or plan for a memorial.

The original act by which this commission was created is entitled "An act to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln." That title is broad enough to include not only a monument, such as is here reported upon, but any other form of memorial. But it is manifest by the line of argument adopted by the gentleman from Illinois that he would limit it to a monument, and there could be no other form of memorial.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can dismiss that part of it from his mind at once, because the Chair thinks it is broad enough to cover any kind of a building that is intended to perpetuate the name of Lincoln. The Chair will ask the gentleman this question: What does the gentleman think about the limitation of that statute as to the place where this memorial is to be built?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, that is no more a necessary feature of this statute than the name of any of the commissioners or any of the other details of the original enactment. Congress intended to—and I believe the Speaker will agree that it did—reserve to itself the final word upon what this memorial should be. The memorial commission actually investigated—so they claim by their report—the Lincoln highway. They actually investigated other forms of memorials. But it is clearly within the power of Congress, having reserved to itself the right to approve or disapprove the findings of the commission created by Congress, to disapprove the findings of the commission and refer the matter to the commission with instructions to report upon some other form of memorial. Otherwise the power of approval reserved would be of no value to Congress.

Now, these gentlemen here have spoken about a bridge. Some of them have spoken about an arch. Some of them have spoken about an industrial school. The gentleman from Kentucky made a very eloquent speech about a road to Richmond. All of these projects seem to have been clearly in the minds of Members of Congress as possible and permissible under some form of memorial to Abraham Lincoln, as designated in the title of that act.

This resolution that I offer simply asks this commission to report on the first Monday in December, 1913, as Congress has the right to ask it to report, upon a memorial highway from Washington to the battle field of Gettysburg or any other appropriate memorial road, bridge, institution, or structure. That language is broad enough to include every proposition that has been debated before the House to-day.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. What does the gentleman say in connection with his statement that this act is broad enough to include his project from here to Gettysburg battle field, when in the language of the act creating this commission these words are used:

To secure and determine upon a location, plans, and design for a monument or memorial in the city of Washington, D. C., to the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

It is not outside; it is not to Gettysburg, but it is in the city of Washington, the District of Columbia.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point I was trying to make. The design and purpose of that original law and of this resolution, which rests only upon that original law, was to find an appropriate memorial to Abraham Lincoln. The other matter was a matter of detail. Undoubtedly that must be one way in one law and another way in another law without changing the fundamental, underlying purpose of the law, which purpose was the establishment of a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; and any form of resolution is germane which is germane to that underlying proposition, without regard to details.

Suppose, instead of being "the District of Columbia," the detail had been that it should be on a certain square in the District of Columbia, or that it should be in a certain part of the District of Columbia, or some other incidental detail. Those matters are purely directory in many laws, but in this one more especially, because it does not enter at all into the fundamental purpose, which is to secure a memorial to Lincoln that Congress deems to be appropriate. If Congress deems that the memorial selected is not appropriate, it must have reserved to itself some vital power—not an empty power over the question—when it finally comes before Congress in the form of a report of the commission.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. And yet in your resolution the District of Columbia is included.

Mr. BORLAND. Under the resolution I offer the commission could bring in any other memorial in the District of Columbia, even this Greek temple, for they are not limited to any particular structure. They are entitled to report upon any other Greek temple or upon an arch or any other memorial.

Now, what is the result of the reasoning of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]? Congress must vote down this proposition unless it is willing to accept, without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t," the report of the Fine Arts Commission and the Lincoln Memorial Commission. If every Member of Congress is not agreed that that is the best form of memorial for Lincoln, there is no parliamentary alternative, according to this argument, except to vote it down. What is the result of that? The commission having reported has no more vitality. The gentleman says we can not extend the life of it; we can not enlarge its powers; we can not change the directions we gave to it. If a line of argument so narrow is followed, then we have no power except to vote it down, thereby putting an end forever to the commission and destroying the very purpose that Congress had, the fundamental purpose of really securing a memorial for Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman hardly intended to say that my contention was that Congress could not change the provisions about the memorial. That is not the question now pending before the Speaker. The question is whether an amendment is germane to the pending proposition. Congress has it within its power to repeal the law providing for the Lincoln Memorial Commission or to amend the law providing for the Lincoln Memorial Commission or to provide other commissions or to do what it pleases about it; but the question here is whether a proposed amendment is germane to a resolution simply approving something as contemplated by law.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The pending resolution is very simple. It is simply to approve certain findings of that commission, that one proposition and nothing else.

The present occupant of the Chair has ruled more than once, or at least he ruled once and proposes to stick to it, that where a law contains several sections and some gentleman brings in a bill to amend one section of that law only, then the House can not wander around and undertake in that bill to amend other sections of that law, because there must be an end and a limit to all things. The statute provides that the Lincoln monument or memorial shall be "in the District of Columbia." That settles that part of it. I do not believe that under that statute you can go outside the District of Columbia. I do not believe that a fair, careful reading of this resolution will permit any amendment providing for passing on another memorial in the city of Washington or out of it.

There are various ways of defeating this proposition. The first step, if the House desires to take it, is to vote this resolution down. Any step might be taken after that. There are two ways of getting rid entirely of this limitation as to the District of Columbia. One of them is by a bill amending the statute creating the commission, and another by a joint resolution, which is tantamount to a bill, for the same purpose. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, does that apply to the amendment that I introduced?

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated a part of the ruling does not apply to the proposition offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to call attention to the fact that my amendment applies to the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that. The last part of the ruling applies to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. The language of this resolution is as simple as it can be, and an amendment that undertakes to amend this resolution by authorizing the erection of another memorial



would not be germane. If the House does not want this memorial, it can vote this joint resolution down.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOOHER. Does that apply to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee? His amendment is to disapprove and refer the matter back to the commission.

The SPEAKER. All of these amendments are exactly alike in substance except the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], which contains another proposition also.

Mr. BOOHER. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee was for a memorial arch within the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that. The Chair says that under this resolution no amendment establishing another memorial to Lincoln, either in the District of Columbia or out of it, is germane to the pending resolution.

Mr. BOOHER. Would not an amendment be in order disapproving the findings of that commission and referring the matter back to them without designating what they shall do?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that when the proper times comes any gentleman in the House can move to recommit the resolution, and if that motion carries that ends it for the time being. But nothing is permissible in a motion to recommit that is not permissible by way of amendment.

Mr. BOOHER. That is what I understood the rule to be, and I am inquiring whether an amendment disapproving the report and referring it back to the commission would be in order.

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit and referring it back would undoubtedly be in order.

Mr. BORLAND rose.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and pending amendments, and I wish to say to a number of gentlemen to whom I have promised time that I am treating them as I have treated myself. I have made no speech, because I felt it important that others could make the speeches.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] was on his feet addressing the Chair before the gentleman from Illinois made his motion. What is it the gentleman from Missouri rose for?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit an amendment, as follows: That the word "approved" in the resolution be stricken out, and in lieu thereof the words "disapproved"; and the matter referred to the commission for further report upon the proposed memorial to Abraham Lincoln be inserted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, to that I make a point of order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER. Has debate been closed by action of the House?

The SPEAKER. Debate has not been closed. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserved the point of order against each one of these amendments as they were offered.

Mr. COOPER. That does not affect the debate on the main question?

The SPEAKER. It does not.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois permit me to make a statement? During the debate in my absence to-day the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] told the House that yesterday I made a mistake in reporting what was written to me by Col. Watrous as to the favorable attitude of the Grand Army of the Republic toward the proposed memorial to Lincoln in this city. He said that he had with him a copy of the resolution adopted at the meeting of the Grand Army of the Republic in Los Angeles last September, which resolution, he said, was against the memorial.

On returning to the Chamber and learning of this statement of the gentleman from Ohio I immediately went to the telegraph office and wired to Col. Watrous in Milwaukee, who, as I said yesterday, was in the Battle of Gettysburg and at one time commander of the Grand Army of the Republic. I told him of the contradiction that the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, had made to my remarks, and asked him to wire me a reply at once. I have his reply, received a few moments ago. It is dated Milwaukee, January 29, 1913, and is addressed to me. It says:

Vote unanimous against road and for memorial in Washington.  
J. A. WATROUS.

Then my friend from Illinois, Mr. EVANS, and my friend from Illinois, Mr. MANN, told me that a soldier on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. THISTLEWOOD, had a certified copy of the record of the proceedings of the Grand Army of the Republic at their meeting in Los Angeles last September. That soldier handed it to me, and with the permission of the

gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] I will occupy time enough to read the resolution in question.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. It is as follows:

Comrade Taylor, of Illinois, read the following report:

"Your committee on report of the committee on Lincoln way approves the report of the committee and recommends the indorsement by this encampment of the Cullom bill for the Lincoln Memorial Commission to erect a monument, to be located on the banks of the Potomac.

"WILLIAM C. ALBERGER,  
"CHARLES H. TAYLOR,  
"ALBERT A. NILES,  
"Committee."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to know how the gentleman from Wisconsin obtained the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] yielded him the time.

Mr. BORLAND. But the gentleman from Illinois did not have the floor. I had the floor to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin rose and obtained the floor by asking to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] had raised the point of order to my amendment.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] yielded the gentleman from Wisconsin time enough to read the telegram.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not see how he could do that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the gentleman from Missouri object to the telegram being read?

Mr. BORLAND. I object to his taking the floor in that manner. Other gentlemen want the floor and can not get it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation, the gentleman from Illinois was recognized and proceeded to and did move the previous question on the resolution to final passage.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. CANNON. I am not mistaken.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state exactly what happened. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] rose and moved the previous question, but prior to that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] had addressed the Chair. The Chair supposed he wanted to make a parliamentary inquiry, and not desiring to cut off any gentleman from the privilege of making a parliamentary inquiry, he asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] to withhold his motion until the Chair could ask what the gentleman from Missouri desired. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] had moved the previous question.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I obtained the floor to offer an amendment and did so, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserved the point of order against the amendment. It was on that situation that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] rose and asked leave to make a parliamentary inquiry, or some sort of an inquiry. Then when he had proceeded for some time he asked for time from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], who had no time and who had not the control of the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believed at that time that that was the shortest way out.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I have only to add that that report was adopted. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORLAND and Mr. EVANS rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted an amendment here against which a point of order has been made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Before discussing that point of order I should like to ask the gentleman to withhold his point of order until I may yield a few minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], who, in fairness, would like to be heard for a few moments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not yield time on a point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, while I did say I made the point of order on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], that amendment was never offered, was never reported from the Clerk's desk, where it is necessary it should be. I have no objection to the gentleman having an opportunity to offer it.

Mr. BORLAND. I offered it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the situation, and I watched it closely, is that the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague, Mr. EVANS, has the floor. He moved the previous question, and then, in the nature of unanimous consent, without his losing the floor, we have had what followed. I think he is entitled to the floor now and has not yielded the floor, as I understand it. I have no objection if the gentleman from Illinois will yield for unanimous consent to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] having a minute, not to interfere with my colleague's right to the floor.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GARNER. I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that the Chair recognized the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] when he was standing on his feet for the purpose of offering an amendment. In the meantime the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] rose before the amendment was offered and the Chair recognized him, and he moved the previous question. Since that time there have been several things done in the way of conversation and parliamentary inquiries, but I submit to the Chair that the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] before he recognized the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. No; no.

Mr. GARNER. I appeal to the record of the notes that the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], and the gentleman from Missouri was about offering his amendment; then the Chair recognized the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], and he moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Here is the situation: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] moved the previous question. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] had been trying to attract the attention of the Chair when he made the ruling on these amendments, and the Chair supposed that he was going to ask a parliamentary inquiry or appeal from the decision of the Chair; but he did neither, and his amendment was never offered.

Mr. GARNER. Well, the parliamentary situation is simply this: If the Chair desired to recognize the gentleman from Missouri for the purpose of offering an amendment, he having been standing on his feet for that purpose, he could have done so, but if he preferred to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] to move the previous question he can do that.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to refresh the Chair's memory for a moment. When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] rose to move the previous question the Chair said of his own motion—

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for me to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be entitled to offer the amendment which he suggested, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] to be permitted to address the House for two minutes, and at the end of that time the previous question be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendment thereto to final passage?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] shall be permitted to offer his amendment, and that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] shall have two minutes, and at the end of which time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether he means the previous question shall be considered as ordered or considered as offered?

Mr. MANN. As ordered.

Mr. BORLAND. Then I will have to object, because I can not—

Mr. CANNON. Regular order!

Mr. BORLAND (continuing). I can not consent to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] moves the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate resolution.

The Senate resolution was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate resolution.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. BOOHER. To move to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had already recognized the other gentleman from Missouri to make a motion to recommit.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be recommitment to the Committee on the Library.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit the resolution to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves the previous question on that motion.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit this resolution to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. On this vote the yeas are 31, the nays are 153, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question that there is no quorum present.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-nine Members are present—a quorum.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the Chair to announce whether or not there was a quorum. I rise for the purpose of asking the presence of the enrolled bill before final passage.

Mr. FOSTER. I make the point of order that it is too late.

Mr. MANN. We had the third reading.

The SPEAKER. The request comes too late.

#### EXPENSES OF INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

Mr. FITZGERALD, from the Committee on Appropriations, by unanimous consent, reported back Senate joint resolution 157, to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States on March 4, 1913, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL.

The SPEAKER. The question is on recommitting Senate joint resolution 158.

Mr. MANN. We had the vote on the motion to recommit, and declined to grant the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair's recollection about this is that immediately after the Chair announced that the vote was on the motion to recommit, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. And then the Speaker went through the counting process to find out whether the yeas and nays would be ordered, and, finally, whether there was a quorum present. The Chair does not believe he can be mistaken about that recollection. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. The yeas have it.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The House has just refused the yeas and nays on this proposition.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall this resolution pass?

The question was taken, and the Senate joint resolution was passed.

On motion of Mr. EVANS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 380. Authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect on March 4, 1913, etc.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. SCULLY, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for one week, on account of illness in his family.



## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m., Thursday, January 30, 1913.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 26737) to amend an act approved October 1, 1890, entitled "An act to set apart certain tracts of land in the State of California as forest reservations," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1411), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 28468) providing for the erection of memorials to Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1414), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5262) for the relief of Sylvester G. Parker, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1412), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURLINSON: A bill (H. R. 28499) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 28500) to promote the safety of employees and passengers upon railroads engaged in interstate traffic; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28501) to regulate the collection of internal revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 28502) to provide for the erection of a monument to Lester Bryant; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 28503) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenues, equalize duties, encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 28504) increasing the limit of cost fixed by act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, for enlargement, extension, etc., of Federal building at Bath, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 28505) to authorize the Minnesota River Improvement & Power Co. to construct dams across the Minnesota River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 28506) to erect an extension to the post office and Federal court building at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 28507) to protect honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, or marines employed under the civil service, who are rated as "good," from discharge or reduction from said service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. CARTER: Memorial from the Legislature of Oklahoma, favoring the election of Federal district judges by the people of their respective States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial from the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, expressing disapproval of the central banking scheme as proposed in the Aldrich currency bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing Congress to make early settlement of the claims of the Choctaw Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Oklahoma, favoring the Kenyon-Sheppard bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 28508) granting a pension to James Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 28509) to amend the military record of Richard Parke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 28510) granting an increase of pension to Rowland T. Vories; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 28511) granting a pension to John C. Gaither, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 28512) for the relief of George Le Clear; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 28513) granting an increase of pension to James M. Vansant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 28514) for the relief of Albert Greenlaw; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 28515) for the relief of Anna De Bord; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 28516) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hector; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 28517) granting a pension to William John Rosenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 28518) granting a pension to Mary Ellen Bousman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 28519) granting a pension to Martha J. Curry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28520) granting an increase of pension to Philip M. Nuckles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 28521) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Kendall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 28522) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hendry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 28523) granting a pension to Josuah H. Brackett; to the Committee on Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Sumter Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of legislation for the purpose of eliminating the pistol from American life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of the United States, suggesting a system of collecting tolls at the Panama Canal, so that there will not be any special privileges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the German-American Peace Society of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 8141, for placing the State Militia on the national pay roll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the New York State Fruit Growers' Association, favoring the passage of House bill 7208, making the trans-Atlantic steamships liable for the damages of packages, etc., caused through negligence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of the Meadville Art Association, Meadville, Pa., favoring the adoption of the Mall site and design as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts for the memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Hafeigh & Co., Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the maintenance of the present tariff on pearl buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the school board of Gerardsboro, Pa., and of John Burroughs, West Park, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 6497, for Federal protection of all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Erie, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 6099, for the establishment of a uniform classification of freight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATHRICK: Petition of sundry citizens of the nineteenth district of Ohio, asking for a congressional investigation of the prosecution by the Government of the Appeal to Reason; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, petition of growers of ginseng of the State of Ohio, favoring an appropriation for the investigation of certain diseases peculiar to ginseng; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of sundry citizens of Lake County, S. Dak., asking for a congressional investigation of the prosecution by the Government of the Appeal to Reason; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, petition of citizens of Lake County, S. Dak., favoring the passage of legislation to investigate the persecution of the editors of the Appeal to Reason by officials of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the New York State Congregational Woman's Home Missionary Union, asking that the tolls at the Panama Canal be submitted to arbitration if it can not be settled by diplomacy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Herbert S. Gardner, St. Louis, Mo., and L. T. Hinsking, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the McLean bill for Federal protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Moller & Schumann Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.; the Oliver Bros. Purchasing Co., New York; the American Laundry Machinery Co., Rochester, N. Y.; and Louis Schulman, New York, favoring the passage of the Weeks bill (H. R. 27567), for 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Lucy Webb Hayes Training School and the Sibley Memorial Hospital, Washington, D. C., protesting against the passage of House bill 27570, relative to certain public lands; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the John Pritzloff Hardware Co., Milwaukee, Wis., favoring passage of the Weeks bill (H. R. 27567), for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of the More-Jones Brass & Metal Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Reinhart Grocer Co., St. Louis, Mo.; and the Webb Freyschlag Mercantile Co., Kansas City, Mo., favoring the passage of the Weeks bill (H. R. 27567), for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Herbert S. Gardner, St. Louis, Mo.; Christopher P. Nelson, Chicago, Ill.; John Burroughs, New York; J. C. Strauss, St. Louis, Mo.; and A. H. Foote, St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of the McLean bill, for Federal protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National League of Government Employees, favoring passage of House bill 20995, granting to certain employees of the United States compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Missouri Naval Reserve, St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 2588, for promoting the efficiency of naval militia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Lucy Webb Hayes Training School and the Sibley Memorial Hospital, Washington, D. C., protesting

against the passage of House bill 27570, relative to certain public lands; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Moon Motor Car Co., St. Louis, Mo., favoring the adoption of a national highway from Washington to Gettysburg for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Everett W. Patterson, St. Louis, Mo., favoring the adoption of the Mall site and design, as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of Boring & Tilton, New York, and the New York Chapter of American Institute of Architects, favoring the adoption of the Mall site and design, as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, Trenton, N. J., protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the control and ownership of national forests to the States wherein they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Conservation Commission, favoring the passage of the Weeks bill making appropriation for the Federal protection of forests from fires; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the United States Live Stock Sanitary Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation to increase the appropriation for eradication of ticks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Illinois Chapter of American Institute, protesting against the adoption of a national highway from Washington to Gettysburg for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Charles R. Post, Brooklyn, N. Y.; George Shawgo, Wesley, Pa.; and James Bathhurst, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 1339 granting an increase in pension to veterans of the Civil War who lost an arm or leg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation granting a Federal charter to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Newman Erb and M. Ross, of New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 1300 for the establishment of a council of national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the New York Conservation Commission, favoring an additional appropriation for Federal aid in protecting the forests from fires; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, of Trenton, N. J., protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the control and ownership of national forests to the States wherein they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of the Cloquet Commercial Club, Cloquet, Minn., protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the control and ownership of national forests to the States wherein they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of citizens of Hartford, Conn., favoring the passage of House bill 1309, for the establishment of a national council of defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of Boring & Tilton and Delano & Aldrich, New York, favoring the adoption of the Mall site and design as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the New York State Legislative Board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring the passage of the Federal workmen's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation granting a Federal charter to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, Trenton, N. J., protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the control and ownership of national forests to the States wherein they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Conservation Commission, favoring the passage of the Weeks bill making appropriation for the Federal



protection of forests from fires; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Rochester Stamping Co., Rochester, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 27567, for 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Boring & Tilton and Ludlow & Peabody, New York, favoring the adoption of the Mall site and design as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts for a memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of George N. Wingate, New York, favoring the passage of House bill 1309, providing for a council of national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Charles R. Post, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 1339, granting an increase of pension to veterans of the Civil War who lost an arm or leg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEELEY: Petition of citizens of the seventh Kansas district, favoring the passage of House bill 25040, for amending the hours-of-service law so that the persons handling orders relative to the movement of trains will not have to work over eight hours; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUJO: Papers to accompany bill to erect an extension to the post office and Federal court building at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the control and ownership of the national forests to the States wherein they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the conservation committee of the State of New York, favoring an additional appropriation for Federal aid for protection of forests from fires; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Fruit Growers' Association, favoring the passage of Senate bill 7208, making trans-Atlantic steamships liable for damages to packages, etc., caused through negligence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va., favoring the passage of legislation for a reform in the banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the New York State Fruit Growers' Association, favoring the passage of Senate bill 7208, making trans-Atlantic steamships liable for damages of packages, etc., caused through negligence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 30, 1913.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1315.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. GALLINGER] laid before the Senate the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1912, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) approving the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln memorial.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the resolution requesting the President to return the bill (S. 7162) to amend section 801 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3175) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24121) to pay certain employees of the Government for injuries received while in the discharge of their duties, and other claims.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 7160) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. FULLER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 8034) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. FULLER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. RICHARDSON presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Churches of Selbyville and Magnolia, in the State of Delaware, praying for the passage of the so-called Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CRAWFORD presented memorials of the congregations of the Seventh-day Adventist Churches of Elk Point, Viborg, Colman, and Beresford, all in the State of South Dakota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MYERS presented memorials of the congregations of the Seventh-day Adventist Churches of Butte and Bozeman, in the State of Montana, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Dillon, Mont., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the parole of Federal life prisoners, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented memorials of the congregations of the Seventh-day Adventist Churches of Ringgold, Ragan, and Collegeview, all in the State of Nebraska, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mound Valley, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Mound Valley, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a resolution adopted by the Aero Club, of Washington, D. C., favoring an appropriation for the establishment of a national aeronautical laboratory in Washington, D. C., which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of St. Paul, Minn., and a memorial of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DU PONT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Smyrna, Del., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the parole of Federal life prisoners, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey (for Mr. BRIGGS) presented memorials of the Thomas A. Edison Co. (Inc.), of Orange, N. J.; of sundry citizens of Newark, Riverside, and New Brunswick, in the State of New Jersey; and of the American Association of Foreign Newspapers, of New York, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the removal of restricted prices on patented goods, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also (for Mr. BRIGGS) presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennington, Canford, Ridgewood, Montclair, Ocean City, East Orange, West Hoboken, Garwood, Orange, Hackensack, Vincentown, Daretown, Moorestown, Clinton, Pleasantville, Madison, Summit, Princeton, Paterson, Newark, Asbury Park, Atlantic City, Springfield, Port Morris, Green Creek, Haddonfield, Long Branch, Somerville, and Oakhurst, all in the